Further:

17. When I say "man" (*anthrōpos*), I indicate the common essence (*ousia*). When I add "a particular man" (*tis*), I indicate the hypostasis, or in other words, the independently subsisting existence (*hyparxis*) of that which is signified, and (so to speak) the circumscription that is denoted by certain properties, whereby those who share the same nature (*physis*) are distinct one from the other, as, for instance, Peter and Paul. As Christ, then, said to the Jews, "Now you are trying to kill me," if he had merely said "man," he might have intended to signify "man" in general. And yet, when he added "Who has told you the truth," he indicated his own hypostasis or person (*prosōpon*). Indeed, the pronoun "who" (*Hos*) is effectively equivalent to the term "one" (*tis*). Thus, even if human nature was assumed in general, yet he assumed it so that it was contemplated in an individual manner; for this reason the possibility of circumscription exists.

Further:

18. The general term "man" (*anthrōpos*) is a common noun (*prosēgorikon onoma*), but "Peter" and "Paul," to give an example, are instances of a proper (*kyrion*) noun. So the particular individual can be called by the common name as well as by his own proper name. For instance, Paul is also called "man." In consideration of what he shares with other individuals of the same species (*homoeidesin*), he is called man; but with regard to his own hypostasis, he is called Paul. If, therefore, the incarnate Christ were called merely God or man by scripture, then he would merely have assumed our nature in general; and, as we demonstrated previously, our nature cannot subsist unless it is contemplated in an individual manner. However, Gabriel said to the Virgin, "Behold, you will conceive in your womb, and bear a son, and you will call his name Jesus."[28] Thus, Christ is called not only by a common name, but also by a proper name, and this distinguishes him from all other men in virtue of his hypostatic properties, and because of this he is circumscribable.[29]

Further:

19. If "Christ" does not denote an individual, as you say, but "man" in general, how then can he say to his disciple, "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?"[30] Thus, he is one like us, even if, as God, he is also one of the Trinity. Therefore, just as he is distinguished from the Father and the Spirit by the property of sonship (*tō hyihō idiōmati*), so he is differentiated from all other men in virtue of the hypostatic properties; for this reason he is circumscribed.

Further:

20. If Christ does not represent an individual, as you say, but a universal man, how then can he say to the Jews, "'Whom do you seek?' And they answered him, 'Jesus of Nazareth,' and he said to them, 'I am he.'"[31] Therefore, Christ is an individual, as he is called by his proper name, Jesus of Nazareth. Thus, if he is an individual, he is also circumscribed, as he is characterized by his hypostatic properties.

Further:

21. Those that are members of the same species (*homoeidē*) are one according to the nature (*kat'ousian*). Yet hypostatically they are distinct one from the other; one is here, and one is there. If Christ, then, does not represent an individual but man in general, as you say, he could not be distinguished from other people (*prosōpon*). As such, how can he say to Peter, "Thus the sons are free. Yet, so as not to cause scandal, go to the sea and cast a hook, and take the first fish that comes up, and when you open its mouth, you shall find a statera; take that and give it to them for me and for yourself."[32] Thus, as he is distinguished from Peter, and equally with Peter he pays the tithe, so equally with him he is circumscribed, as someone who represents an individual, even as he has assumed human nature in general.

Objection from the iconoclasts:

22. "If the Word assumed human nature in his hypostasis, since this nature is invisible and lacking in shape, if it were given shape by circumscription, a second person (*prosōpon*) would be incorporated into the hypostasis of Christ; but this is absurd, and indeed, it is similar to the heresy of Nestorius, since it would attest a duality of persons (*prosōpon*) in Christ."[33]

Response to the latter:

If we say that the flesh assumed by the Word is invested with its own hypostasis, what you say would make sense. However, given that according to the consensus of the church (*kata tēn ekklēsiastikēn doxan*), we confess that the hypostasis of the Word has become the shared hypostasis of the two natures, and that it endows with a hypostasis the human nature that rests in it, together with the properties that differentiate it from the others belonging to the same species, we may then reasonably claim that the very same hypostasis is uncircumscribed according to the nature of the divinity, and that instead it is circumscribed according to the nature that it shares with us; this human nature does not have its own subsistence (*hyparxin*) in

a person (*prosōpon*) that is self-subsistent and self-circumscribed outside the hypostasis of the Word, but in this very hypostasis—since there cannot be a nature that lacks a hypostasis (*anhypostatos*)[32]—and it is contemplated and circumscribed in an individual manner.

Further:

23. If, given that a second person cannot be admitted into the hypostasis of Christ, they were to say that the hypostasis is uncircumscribed with respect to the humanity, they must necessarily say that there is one nature of the Word that is composed (*synkratheisan*) of two natures, and therefore it cannot be circumscribed, since neither of the set of properties has been eliminated; this is related to the belief of the Akephaloi, and of the Apollinarians.[33]

Further:

24. If, because a second person is not admitted into the hypostasis of Christ, they were to say that the hypostasis is uncircumscribable with respect to the humanity, [this would entail] that he did not really assume the latter, but only the appearance and form of the flesh, as claimed by the Montanists.[34] But if he did so in truth, as indeed we confess, the hypostasis of Christ is circumscribed, not according to the divinity, which no one ever saw, but according to the humanity, which in it is contemplated in an individual manner; how could one be the mediator (*mesitēs*) between God and humanity without preserving in an intact manner the properties of the two natures wherein he subsists?

Further:

25. Where (*Pou*) signifies the location by which a body is contained. Thus not only is the body circumscribed, but also the place that contains it, and only that which is outside location is uncircumscribed, as it lacks in limits. If, therefore, the Christ is not circumscribed, not only is he not a body, but also he is without location; how, then, can he say, "The bread I give you, this is my flesh"?[35] And similarly, he answered, "Come and see," to Andrew and the other disciple who asked, "Where do you live?" and [scripture] says, "They came, and saw where he lives." Thus he is circumscribed, as someone who has assumed a body, independently of whether he stays, or he leaves, or he returns home.

Further:

26. A seeming contradiction (*enantiotēs*) suggests that Christ is not circumscribed, as scripture says, "You have heard the sound of the words, but you saw no form; there was only a voice."[36]

If Moses, speaking of the God of all, says, "You have heard the sound of the words, but saw no form," and yet Isaiah says, "We saw Him, and He had no shape or beauty, His appearance was dishonorable, and inferior to that of all sons of men,"[37] how can such claims come to terms with each other, if indeed one does not conflict with the other? Clearly, both are speaking about the same thing; one is talking against the possibility of the Godhead being present in a likeness, since divinity cannot be seen; the other is talking of the fact that the very same Lord was seen in our form, after having assumed the shape of a servant. Hence, Christ is circumscribed in body, even if he remains uncircumscribed in terms of his divinity.

Further, asking a question by way of a deductio ad absurdum*:*

27. If Christ is uncircumscribable, and Isaiah says of him, "A man who received blows, and acquainted with the bearing of sickness,"[38] I will ask whether what receives blows is a body, or is lacking in corporeality. If it is incorporeal, it has the appearance of a ghost, but if it is a body, how can it possibly not be circumscribed, characterized by three dimensions, and by hardness (*antitypia*),[39] so that it can naturally be wounded?

Further:

28. If Christ is not circumscribed, how can he say, "I gave over my back to the whips, and my cheeks to those who pulled out my beard; I did not turn away my face from the shame of spits"?[40] These are truly properties of circumscription: a back being whipped, a beard being pulled out, a face (*prosōpon*) being spit upon. Thus, if it is true that he suffered, he lies who says that he was not circumscribed.

Further:

29. If Christ is uncircumscribable, how can he himself say, "They have pierced my hands and my feet; they counted all my bones"?[41] Indeed, that which is uncircumscribable does not have a nature to be pierced, or to have its bones counted. And instead, the hands were pierced, and the bones were said to be counted; affirming these things is a confirmation of circumscription.

Further, resorting to philosophical speculation (theōria)*:*

30. A line is a length devoid of width, comprised by two points; a drawing (*epigraphē*) has its beginning in a line.[42] A figure (*schēma*) is something that is composed of at least three lines; and from the figure begins the body, which is made up of different (*diaphorōn*) figures, and it is circumscribed by place. What is uncircumscribable, however, is dissimilar to these; it is certainly not bound by a line or by a form or a place

or a body. If Christ, then, is uncircumscribable, he will be found neither as having taken over a form, nor in a place, and certainly not in a body. Yet, he was found in a figure, as a man (*anthrōpos*), according to the scripture; and he was circumscribed by a place, living in Nazareth, and he became flesh, as the Evangelist says; hence he is also circumscribed."

Further, according to an evangelical comparison:

31. If Christ is uncircumscribable, how can the Forerunner (*ho Prodromos*) say, "See the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world"?[34] What is seen cannot be uncircumscribable, and this is even more the case for things that are pointed out with the finger (*to daktylodeiknoumenon*). If, instead, something is perceived in this way, then it would be within circumscription, and it would be marked by the finger. Hence, Christ is circumscribed.

Further, putting forth a doubt:

32. If Christ is uncircumscribable, he is not of two natures—the divine and the human—because he does not have the properties of each. For circumscription is characteristic of humanity. But if he is of two [natures], how can he possibly fail to have the properties of the natures that he has?[35]

Further, through a comparison of the thesis of the Theopaschites:

33. If it is heretical to say, as the Theopaschites do, that because Christ was crucified in the flesh, the Godhead (*to theion*) also suffers, then in the same way, it is heretical to say that, because he is circumscribed by the flesh, the Godhead is also circumscribed (which is the teaching of the iconoclasts); and this is the most impious claim of all, all the more so as the flesh is conjoined to the divinity through a union of natures, while the image [lit. "the shadow"] that is depicted is united to the flesh by a union of relation (*schetikōs*).[36]

An objection from the iconoclasts:

34. "If Christ is of two natures, why is it that, when you claim to portray him, you do not portray both natures from which and in which he is, if what you say is true?" But given that one of the two is falsified, given that it does not contain the uncircumscribability of the divine nature in the human circumscription, it is then heretical to circumscribe Christ."

Solution of the above:

When anyone is depicted, it is not the nature but the hypostasis that is depicted; how, then, could a nature be portrayed if it were not contemplated in a hypostasis? For instance, Peter is not portrayed inas-

much as he is a rational and mortal animal, endowed with intuition and reason; this, in fact, does not define just Peter, but also Paul and John and all those who belong to the same species (*eidos*). But inasmuch as he adds to the common definition (*onu*) a set of specific properties, such as a crooked or a simian nose, curly hair, a good complexion, or beautiful eyes, or whatever else characterizes his particular appearance (*idea*), he is distinguished from the other individuals that belong to the same species. In addition, even if he consists of body and soul, he does not show the property of the soul in the appearance of his form; how could that be, given that the soul is invisible? The same applies to the case of Christ. It is not because of the fact that Christ, alongside being divine, is also a human being, that Christ can be portrayed, but rather because he is differentiated by his hypostatic properties from all the other members of his species; he is crucified and has a certain appearance. Thus, Christ is circumscribed with respect to his hypostasis, but he is uncircumscribed with respect to his divinity, or with respect to the two natures of which he is composed."

Further:

35. If Christ is not circumscribed, as you say, lest he may be diminished in glory, then he was not conceived in the womb of the Virgin, so as not to undergo humiliation. And yet, if he was conceived in utter humility (*anhybristōs*), all the more so as he became an infant, then he is circumscribed without indignity (*anepaschystōs*).

Further, as a deductio ad absurdum:

36. Everything that moves is not the species that can be defined according to a general principle—indeed this is invisible, and lacking in form and shape, and thereby uncircumscribable—but is rather the individual, which it is natural should consist of properties, and this is seen and moves and speaks, and for this reason is circumscribed, as for instance, James and John. If, therefore, Christ is uncircumscribable, he is not seen, he does not move, nor does he speak with a clear voice, not having a tongue or lips; nor would he eat or drink, nor would he sleep or wake up, nor do any of the things that one can do or endure. But if he is confessed to have done these things, how can he not be circumscribed, unless the mystery of the divine dispensation (*oikonomia*) is sheer phantasy?

Further:

37. If things that are of a different kind (*oikogeneia*) and are not of the same essence (*ouch homoeuthē*), have properties that correspond

to their essences, such as, the divinity and the humanity, how is it then that Christ, who is from both, is not in both, if indeed every essence is distinguished from all others in virtue of its own property? And yet, if he is in both, he is circumscribed, in the same way as he is uncircumscribed.

Further:

38. The true (*alēthōs*) properties of the essences are indicative of the essences of which they are the properties; for instance, uncircumscribability makes divinity known, and circumscribability makes humanity known. If Christ is then from both, he is circumscribed in the same way as he is uncircumscribed. But if he is not circumscribed, then he is not truly man, in the same way as he is truly God. But if he is truly man, then he is truly circumscribed.

An objection from a member of the iconoclast group:

39. "If the Son is an exact (*aparallaktos*) image of the Father, so that the Father appears in him, as it is said in scripture, 'He who has seen me, has also seen the Father,'[49] it is necessary that we should say that he who comes from the uncircumscribable Father is also uncircumscribed. For how is it possible that that which is uncircumscribed should be seen in what is circumscribed? Therefore Christ is uncircumscribable."

A response to the above, following a similar argument:

If he who comes from the uncircumscribable Father is also uncircumscribed, then clearly he who comes from a circumscribed mother will also be circumscribed; unless perhaps it is the case that the former is true and the latter is false. But if both things are true in the one Christ, then he has also acquired the properties of both origins, and he is simultaneously uncircumscribable and circumscribed.

Further, by deductio ad absurdum*:*

40. If the archetype (*to archetypon*) appears in the image, let us suppose that the latter is in all respects like the former. But Christ is endowed with a body (*ensōmatos*). Then the Father should also be endowed with a body, given that the image is modeled after him. But if this is absurd, let us say that Christ is uncircumscribed, inasmuch as he is the image of the Father; indeed the Father, as he is incorporeal, is uncircumscribed. Yet, according to what he himself said—and do not consider this strange—he is also the Son of man, and as such he is circumscribed; indeed, each human being is circumscribed, because each is endowed with a body, and this is the truth.

Further:

41. If, as you say, it was in reference to his corporeal appearance (*idea*) that Christ said, "He who has seen me, has seen the Father," then it is necessary that he should be invested with the same properties that belong to the Father according to the nature (*kata physin*); in this way, the imprint (*ho charaktēr*) is accurate (*akribēs*). And yet the Father has no form, or shape, or circumscription [or comprehension]. These properties also belong to Christ. For how could formlessness (*to aneideon*) appear in someone who has been endowed with a form, or shapelessness in one who has been invested with a shape, or uncircumscribability in one who has been circumscribed? But if this is heretical, then it would also be heretical to claim that Christ is talking of his corporeal appearance when he says, "He who sees me, also sees the Father." The only possible alternative is to say (*leipetai dē legein*) that he is speaking of the form of divinity; and this is the truth.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

42. "If Christ were a mere human being (*psilos anthrōpos*)," they say, "he would also be circumscribed, because circumscription is a characteristic of a mere man; but since he is not a mere man—given that he is God no less than a human being—he is not circumscribed."

A solution to the above:

If, in denying that Christ is a mere human being,[50] they were to say that he is uncircumscribable, they would also have to say that he is bodiless. This is because a thing is recognizable as corporeal if it is circumscribed and has a form. If these qualities are not there, however, then it is also necessary to deny that to which they belong. But Christ is in a body and in a form; hence, he also has circumscription.

Further:

43. If, because of the fact that Christ is not a simple man, they should say that he is uncircumscribable according to the humanity, given that this is a property of the divine nature, things would be mingled that cannot be mingled (*emichthē ta amikta*), or in other words, circumscription [is mingled] in uncircumscribability. And if properties of things are mixed, the same also happens with the natures. And if to say or think such a thing is impious, then Christ is not a mere man even as he is circumscribed in the body, since otherwise, in virtue of the circumscription, things that cannot be mingled would be mingled.[51]

Further:

44. That which is uncircumscribed is simple and not composed (*asynthetas*), since it is utterly exempt from all position (*theseōs*). Christ, however, being double and composite (*diplous kai synthetos*),[52] if he were not circumscribable, would lose the form and the use of duality and composition. However, we confess that he is double and composite; thus he is circumscribed, which is the truth.

Further:

45. The male and the female gender are to be sought merely in the forms of bodies, since none of the difference that characterizes the two can be seen in incorporeal realities. Thus, if Christ is uncircumscribable, as being without a body, he would also be beyond the difference that we just mentioned. But, as Isaiah says, "He was born male (*arsēn techtheis*) from the prophetess";[53] thus he is circumscribed.

Further:

46. Some bodies may only be divided in thought; for instance, some cannot be touched, and as such are uncircumscribable; other bodies, instead, can be cut in actuality; for instance, some are solid (*pachymerē*), because they can be touched, and as such they can be circumscribed. If, then, Christ assumed a body that cannot be cut (*atmēton sōma*), then this body is also uncircumscribable. But Christ's body can be cut (*tmēton*); indeed, Luke of blessed speech says, "And when the eight days were passed of his circumcision (*peritemein*)."[54] And if he was circumcised, then he was circumscribed—and this is the truth.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

47. "If whatever bodies cannot be cut or touched are also uncircumscribable, then, given that the angels are incorporeal, how is it possible that they be subject to circumscription? Hence, if they are circumscribed, they are also corporeal. And if they are incorporeal, then they are not circumscribable."

A solution to the above:

In comparison to a thick body, the nature of the angels is incorporeal; but if considered next to the divinity, it is neither incorporeal, nor is it uncircumscribed.[55] For this reason the Apostle says, "There are celestial bodies, and there are terrestrial bodies."[56] That which is truly (*kyrōs*) incorporeal is limitless and uncircumscribable; this applies exclusively to the divine nature; an angel, however, is bound by place and therefore is circumscribable. Indeed, when [the angel Gabriel] went to Nazareth and said to the Virgin, "Rejoice!" he was

not somewhere else.[57] But the Word of the Father, having been conceived in the womb of the Mother of God, was there, and at the same time, he was everywhere else. And for this reason he is God, uncircumscribable no less than boundless; although as a man, because he was born of the Virgin, he is circumscribed.

Further:

48. If he who was in the form of God and took the form of a servant is not circumscribed,[58] this latter form would be nothing but the divine form. This is because uncircumscribability characterizes the divine form. And yet, if the form of a servant is different and is consubstantial (*homoousios*) with us, how could he possibly have taken the form without having taken its property? Given that we whose form he took are circumscribed, Christ is circumscribed as well.

Further:

49. If the fact that Christ is circumscribed as a human being weakens those properties in virtue of which he, as God, is not circumscribed, it is then also necessary that the things that he is seen to do and say as man would weaken those properties by which he is revealed to be God, preaching and working miracles. If, instead, one thing is not violated by the other, and each of the two remains within its limits in the one Christ that is made of the two, then it is not the case that circumscription is not eliminated by uncircumscribability.

Further, from a comparison in the inspired scriptures:

50. Talking to the Jews, the Savior said, "Before Abraham was, I am."[59] And yet the evangelist [Matthew] says, "This is the book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham." In what way, then, can he who was before Abraham be the son of Abraham? Is it not clear, then, that we should understand that one statement is appropriate to divinity, and one is appropriate to humanity? And the same should be thought concerning circumscribability and uncircumscribability; indeed, one will not take away from the other in the single Christ who is acknowledged to be from both.

Further:

51. If every mediator (*mesitēs*) mediates between two persons who are in opposition to each other, distributing within himself in an equal manner the rights of either part, it is, then, necessary that Christ, who is the mediator between God and humanity, and who, by a right judgment, unites the extremes as it were into a natural union (*eis enōtēta physikēn*), must be uncircumscribable in spirit but circumscrib-

able in body.[80] If he were to favor one—namely, uncircumscribability—and he were not to preserve unharmed the circumscribability, he would fall short from being a just mediator.

Further:

52. If Christ died as a man, and no injury was inflicted to him as a God, it would be no disgrace to him to be circumscribed in any way. But if circumscription is demeaning, then to be put to death (*hē thnētsis*) is even more so.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

53. "Circumscribing Christ is somewhat incompatible with, and abhorrent to, the divinely inspired scripture. Indeed, scripture says, 'And the Lord spoke to you on the mountain from the midst of fire, and you heard the sound of the words, but you did not see a likeness, but only a voice.'"[81] Thus, to erect an image of Christ is incompatible with the divine commands.

A solution to the above:

Those who speak in this manner make themselves deaf deliberately, as they do not recognize for what reason Holy Scripture would bar a shape or a likeness, or why there is a prohibition of any other representation used as an idol; the reason is that scripture is talking of the divine nature—the Godhead (*to theion*) is indeed without quantity and form (*aposon te esti kai aschēmatiston*)[82]—and not of the Word that has been ontologically transformed according to our form. In fact, if the latter were the case, how could the evangelist then say, "And as he was praying, the appearance of his face was transformed, and his garment became white and resplendent"?[83] See here how the one who had no appearance (*ho aneideos*) had an appearance, or indeed a likeness; the one who had no form was given a form; and the one who had no quantity became subject to quantity. And since his countenance was characterized by certain particular properties, Christ is thus circumscribed with respect to his corporeal appearance, in the same way as he is circumscribed with respect to his invisible essence.

Further, by a deductio ad absurdum*:*

54. If it is necessary that whatever is born should come from the same type of being as the one belonging to the one who gives birth—and the mother of Christ is circumscribed—thus even Christ will be circumscribed, since he is her son, even if he is God by nature. Therefore, if he is not circumscribed, he would not be consubstantial

to his mother; hence, it would follow that his mother is not his mother, which is absurd.

An objection from the iconoclasts, by way of an apostolic comparison:

55. "Everyone will understand that the practice of depicting Christ is an invention reflecting an idolatrous frame of mind (*epinoia*). Indeed, the Apostle says somewhere, 'And they exchanged the glory of the immortal God into the likeness of the image of a mortal human being, and they prostrated themselves, and offered adoration to the creation instead of the Creator.'"[84]

A response to the latter:

To speak in an apostolic manner, it is true (*tō onti*) that the iconoclasts have fallen into a degenerate state of mind (*adokimon noun*): "Their foolish heart is obscured; and claiming to be wise, they became unwise."[85] "They understand neither what they are saying, nor what they are talking about."[86] Indeed, if it is to prohibit the practice of portraying Christ that the Apostle says, "They exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of the image of the corruptible human being," he has not yet confessed that he has become man.[87] How, then, can he say elsewhere, "Who being in the form of God, did not consider that equality to God was a thing to be grasped; rather, he emptied himself (*eauton ekenōse*), taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of human beings, and being found in the form of man. He humbled himself, being made obedient unto death, and a death on the cross"?[88] Thus it would seem that he contradicts himself, denying at one point that God has been made equal to human beings, and saying at another point that he was born in the likeness of men. But let go of this foolishness! The first passage is applied to those who engage in idolatry, who "exchanged the glory of the immortal God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of quadrupeds, and of serpents";[89] "who exchanged the truth of God into a lie, and venerated and served the creature instead of the Creator."[90] The second passage is instead meant for the faithful, who believe that the Word of God, while remaining in the form of God, was also made similar [to us], not by being equal to God, but by emptying himself and assuming the form of a servant, so that he was found in a form that is similar to that of man; and all such things are characteristics of circumscription.

Further:

56. If we are the body of Christ, and we are all his members and Christ is our head,[91] then it is quite certain that the head should be

circumscribed in the same way as the members. If, instead, he were uncircumscribable, we would have ceased to be members of Christ, as we are subject to the form of circumscription. And how is this not of the ultimate absurdity (*euētheia*)?

Further, regarding the passage "I am the vine":

57. If, as scripture says, the Savior is the vine, and we are the branches, then clearly the branches do not have a different nature (*heterophyē*) from the vine. But if this is true, given that the branches are circumscribed, how can the vine not be circumscribed? For the vine is recognized by the branches.

Further:

58. It is impossible that things that belong to different species (*heterogenē*) or to different natures (*heterophyē*) should have the same properties (*idiotēta*); no one, indeed, would say that fire moves downward, whereas water moves upward; but in the same way as they have a distinct principle of being (*tēs ousias logon*), so they should have a distinct mode of property (*tēs idiotētos tropon*).[72] Since Christ belongs to two different natures that are not consubstantial (*ouch homoousiōn*) —meaning the divinity and the humanity[73]—he will also be known by two sets of properties. One then will not be circumscribed, and the other will be circumscribed. In fact, through the elimination of the property, that essence that is characterized by that property is also eliminated.

Part 2

Since Christ is circumscribed, he also has an artificial image (technētēn eikona) *in which he is contemplated, because the image is itself in Christ*

Whatever is artificial is creation in imitation of what is natural; for, in fact, nothing would be called artificial if it were not preceded by something that is natural. Thus, there is an artificial image of Christ, as he is himself the natural image of his mother, who gave birth to him. If the latter were true, but the former false, he would not be the natural image of his mother because he would not have an artificial image as she does—which is absurd.[74]

Further:

Every image has a relationship (*empherreia*) to its archetype, but the natural image has a natural relationship, whereas the artificial image has an artificial relationship. The former is identical both in essence and in likeness with that of which it is the imprint (*aposphragisma*)[75]; thus Christ, according to his divinity, is identical to his own Father and, according to his humanity, is identical to his own mother. The latter, however, while being identical in likeness, is distinct from the essence of the archetype; this is how the image of Christ relates to Christ himself. Therefore, there is an artificial image of Christ to whom [the image] has a relationship.

An objection as from the iconoclasts:

"If Christ has an artificial image insofar as he is the natural image of his mother, then, in order that there should be no discrepancy at all from the relationship, he would also have an artificial image inasmuch as he is the image of the invisible Father. But if this is the case, the divine would not be outside circumscription—which is heretical."

A response to the above:

Out of their utter foolishness, the iconoclasts mingle things that cannot be mixed, nor do they understand how each origin (*gennēsis*) is endowed with its own properties, by which Christ is uncircumscribed but is also circumscribed. With respect to the fact that he proceeds from the uncircumscribable Father, and is therefore uncircumscribable, he would not have an artificial image; to what simulacrum could the Godhead be compared, regarding which there is utter absence (*apophasis*) of description in the inspired scriptures? With respect to the fact that he is born out of the circumscribed mother, it is most appropriate that he should have an image, corresponding to the appearance of the mother. But if he did not have one, he would not be from the circumscribed mother, and he would then be from only one generation, namely that from the Father—which fact is incompatible with the divine plan (*oikonomia*).

If what is displayed in the image shows a relationship (*empherreia*) to the prototype, and it is impossible that there should be a prototype and there should not be an image—according to the Lord's saving, "Whose image is this, and whose inscription?"[76] and to what he subsequently says to his questioners, "Render to Caesar what is of Caesar, and to God what is of God"[77]—then Christ, having become like us

(*gegonôs*),[79] has an artificial image, which is related to him through a relationship of likeness. And if he does not have an artificial image, then he is not what is called the Christ.[79] But Christ is, and is called, the truth itself (*autoalētheia*).[80] Therefore, he has an image, and as the relationship of veneration of this image goes over to him, there is no distinction in glory that separates the two.

Further, based on the statement, "Let us make man in our image and likeness":[81]

The fact that man is made in the image and likeness of God shows that to undertake the work of iconography (*eikonourgia*) is a divine activity. But since an image can be copied (*metagraphetai*) from an image, given that he is man while also being God, Christ can be portrayed in an image, not in spirit but in body. But if he is portrayed under one of the two natures, then clearly he must have an image exactly resembling him, so as to display the shared likeness.

Further:

If Adam, the first man, is circumscribed by [his] form (*tō eidei*), then Christ, who is the second Adam, since he is both God and man, can similarly be represented in his bodily form. If, then, "as the son of the earth was, so are those who are earthly; and as the son of heaven was, so are those who are heavenly," and if we who are of heaven can be represented, then Christ, who is the one who laid the foundation (*archēgos*) of the salvation of all, is also the archetype of his own image.

Further:

If God is not in need of any help, or subject to any suffering of any kind, how is it that the Apostle says about him, "In the days of his flesh, he offered up prayers and supplications to the one who could free him from death, with great shouting and tears, and he was heard because of his obedience (*eulabeia*)"?[82] Is it not clear that the one without flesh who assumed flesh is unable to suffer and is immune to suffering, and yet he suffers, in the same way as he is uncircumscribed and he is circumscribed? And if he is circumscribed, he also has an image that resembles him and that reveals the mutual likeness.

Part 3

The veneration of Christ and of his image is one and indivisible

An objection coming from the iconoclasts:

1. If everything that is made in the likeness of something else inevitably falls short of equality with its prototype, and is second to it in terms of glory, then clearly, in terms of veneration, Christ is not the same as his portrait. And if these things are different, the veneration that is introduced is also different. This, then, is the cause of idolatrous adoration.

A solution to the above:

The prototype is not in the image according to the essence; if this were the case, the image would also be called prototype, and conversely, the prototype would be called image. This is inappropriate, because the nature (*physis*) of each has its own definition. Rather, [the prototype is in the image] by the similarity of the hypostasis, for which there is no different principle of definition (*logos tēs diorismōs*).[83] Thus, the fact that the image does not equal the prototype and is inferior to its glory is not understood in terms of the hypostasis, but rather in terms of the difference in essence. The nature of the image is not worthy of veneration, and yet he who is represented in it is seen so that he may be venerated. Thus, there is no introduction of a different kind of veneration, but the image has the same veneration [as the prototype], according to the identity of the likeness.

Further:

2. It is not the essence of the image that we venerate, but the imprint (*charaktēr*) of the prototype that is inscribed in it, given that the essence of the image is not susceptible of veneration (*aproskynētos*). Nor is it the material (*hē hylē*) that is worthy of veneration, but rather the prototype together with the imprint, and not the essence. If, then, the image [is venerated], the veneration is one with the prototype, in the same way as the likeness (*homoiōsis*) is the same.[84] Thus, whenever the icon is venerated, there is no introduction of another veneration beyond the veneration of the prototype.

Further:

3. Those realities that do not have the same imprint, have different venerations; likewise, those realities that do have the same

imprint, have the same veneration. But the imprint of the icon with regard to the prototype is one; thus, the veneration is also one.

Further:

4. Everything that is unequal is different from that which is equal; thus, everything that takes second place with regard to glory is distinct from what takes first place. They are two different things, and not one. Wherever there is equality, inequality is erased. And wherever there is identity, the distinction between first and second is eliminated. Now, the image of the emperor is also called image, and not two emperors. Indeed, as it is written, the power is not scattered, nor is the glory fragmented.[46] Thus, there is one glory, and there is no introduction of a second veneration, as the image of Christ is venerated because of Christ. Clearly, however, [the icon] is inferior and takes second place in terms of glory according to the principle of the essence.

Further:

5. Even if we grant that the image lacks resemblance (*hisotypon*) from the prototype because of lack of technical ability (*ex atechnias*), yet even in this case our claim would not be inappropriate. Indeed, the veneration is given in virtue of what is identical, and not in virtue of what is inferior in terms of the relationship. In this respect, the icon is identical to the prototype, and there are not two objects of veneration, but one and the same, the prototype in the image; the same goes for the symbol (*typon*) of the cross in relation to the life-giving (*zoōpoion*) cross itself, given that, in this case, the iconic representation is not identical to the archetype in terms of length or width or any other characteristic, because it is represented in different ways. One can see a cross that is small and large, wider and narrower, having blunt and sharp ends, with inscription and without inscription. And this is to pass under silence the varieties of decorations underneath and on top, and the variety of skills. But nevertheless, in the presence of all these differences, there is one veneration of the symbol and of the prototype; the same identity is clearly discerned in both.

Further, by way of example:

6. If the life-giving cross is venerated in its own symbol, and there are not two venerations, because there is not another veneration from the essence of the symbol, it is then necessary that, as Christ is venerated in his own proper image, there are not two venerations; since there is no veneration of the essence of the image, but one and the same veneration ascribed to Christ and to the icon.

Further:

7. If despite the fact that the Son differs in some ways from the Father—albeit the difference is merely in terms of the property of sonship—nothing prevents him from having the same substance and the same veneration as the Father; in a similar way, the fact that the image differs in some way from the prototype, and the difference is in terms of the principle of the essence, does in no way prevent it from having the same likeness and veneration as the prototype. In the same way as Christ is distinguished from the Father by his hypostasis, so is he distinguished from his image by his essence.

Further:

8. If the image is the object of a distinct veneration (*eteroproskynētos*) from its own prototype, in what way is the latter seen in it, and in its turn how is it seen in the prototype? Clearly, so to speak, we do not contemplate the form of Peter in Paul; similarly, no one can discern the form of Paul in the form of Peter. This is because "like" appears in "like," whereas things that are reciprocally distinct in likeness could never appear in each other; so the image of Peter appears in Peter, and Peter appears in his own image. Thus, the image of Christ is not venerated differently from Christ himself but is the object of the same veneration (*homoproskynētos*), as it bears a relationship and a similarity to it.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

9. If veneration from us and from the angels is only due to God, how can there be a single veneration of the icon of Christ? Indeed, we profess that the image is venerated by relationship, whereas Christ is venerated by nature. Thus, there are two kinds of veneration in Christ, because of the veneration of the image, which is impious.

An answer to the above:

If it is the case that, because we offer veneration only to God, we should not venerate the image of Christ, on the ground that we would be introducing two kinds of veneration instead of the one and only adoration (*latreutēn*), in accordance with the distinction between image and prototype, then the veneration to the Father and to the Son should also be dual, because of the distinction between the two hypostases. But this is impious to say; one indeed and the same [is the veneration] according to the obvious oneness (*to monadikon*) of the divine nature, and so one is also veneration of Christ and that toward

his own image, in virtue of the oneness of the hypostatic similarity, and not because of the diversity of the natures.

Further:

10. One talks of a relation inasmuch as the copy (*to paragōgon*) is in the prototype; one is not separated from the other because of this, but only because of the distinction in essence. Thus, since the image of Christ is said to have in its own linear structure (*epigraphē*) the very form of Christ, then similarly the veneration is one with Christ and not distinct.

A claim from the iconoclasts:

11. "How could it ever be possible that the identity of veneration were preserved in the case of Christ and his image, if indeed Christ is venerable by nature (*physei*), whereas the image is venerable by position (*thesei*)?[10] It is, in fact, absolutely necessary to say that what is in a certain way by nature can in no way change. If this is the case, nothing prevents us from saying that the icon [can be venerated] by nature, and Christ by position; and everything gets confused."

*The solution to the above, by way of a mutual interrogation (*anterōtēmatōs*):*

But how, O excellent men, could it ever be possible that the identity of veneration were not preserved in the case of Christ and his own image, if the image is the likeness of Christ, and the image reveals Christ in itself? It is indeed clearly known, and it must be acknowledged by all, that no one can see the appearance of one, let us say Luke, in the appearance of the other, let us say Thomas. Indeed, the appearance of the likeness takes place in things that have a relationship of identity (*en tois tautempheresin*) and not in things that differ from each other in terms of their defining characteristic. If therefore this is true, and he who has seen the image of Christ has seen Christ in it, it is absolutely necessary to say of the image that in the same way as there is one likeness, so the veneration of the image of Christ is the same as the veneration addressed to Christ.

Further:

12. That which is similar in some degree (*kata ti*) [to something else] shares the same veneration to the degree in which it is similar. That, on the other hand, which is similar in all respects should share the veneration in all respects. But the Son is similar in all respects to the Father, given that he is consubstantial; thus, he is also worthy of the same veneration. The image of Christ, however, is related (*empheris*)

solely according to the similarity of his hypostasis; therefore, only in this respect could it share its veneration.

Further:

13. If one who has seen the image sees in it also the likeness of the prototype, there is an absolute necessity that he who venerates the image should venerate in it the form (*to eidos*) of the prototype as well. But since the likeness is one, one is also the veneration of both.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

14. "If the image that is patterned after Christ shares in his veneration, how can Christ himself say 'My glory I do not give to anyone else?'[11] Thus [the image] does not share [in the veneration]. But if it does not share in the veneration, then it must be conceded that it is venerated idolatrously, since a second type of veneration is thereby introduced."

The solution to the above:

The image of Christ is nothing else but Christ, with the exception obviously of the substance, as has been indicated many times. Thus, it is the case that the veneration of the image is the same as the veneration of Christ; of course, the material of the image is not venerated, but rather only Christ who is expressed in likeness in the image. Indeed, it is clear that things that share the same substance also share the same veneration. Thus, in his own icon, Christ does not give his own glory to anyone else, but rather he appropriates this glory for himself in the image, because the material is different from the likeness. Indeed, even if they are made with different materials, the same imprint is in all [images]. And the form would not remain unchanged in the different materials, were it not for the fact that it does not have anything in common with them; rather, it is conceptually (*tē epinoia*) distinct from the materials in which it inheres.

An objection on the part of the iconoclasts:

15. If God is spirit, as scripture says, and it behooves those who adore him to do so in spirit and in truth, how is it then possible not to introduce a display of idolatry in the icon, when you say that Christ, inasmuch as he is God, should be venerated in spirit?

Answer to the above:

Who is not aghast at seeing how full of insanity the iconoclasts are, as they do not distinguish how different the mystery of the economy is from that of theology, under which purview one should consider the saying "One must venerate in spirit and in truth"? As then

God the Father is also spirit, he is understood to be venerated in the Holy Spirit and in the Truth, which is his only begotten Son.[88] But the veneration of Christ in the image belongs to the rationale (*logos*) of the economy. Even if Christ is spirit inasmuch as he is God, yet he is also flesh inasmuch as he is also a human being. And even if his image in the form of a body (*sōmatoeidēs*) is given a likeness in a material, yet it is inseparable from Christ, as a shadow is inseparable from its own body. It is not the material of the image that is venerated, but rather the Christ that is portrayed in it—Christ in whom the Father is venerated, and the Holy Spirit.

PART 4

Since Christ is the prototype of his own image, he has one relationship as well as one veneration with it

1. The prototype and the image are one thing in terms of the hypostatic likeness, and two separate things in terms of the nature; not in the manner of one thing that is divided into two likenesses, so that afterward they no longer have anything in common or any relationship with each other; nor is it the case that the one and same entity is called by two different names, so that at one time the prototype is called image, and at another time the image is called prototype. This is because the prototype would always be called prototype, and the image would be called image, never changing into each other. Even if this is the way things stand, and even if we are talking of two different things, both have one likeness and one way of addressing them (*prosēgoria*) in accordance to the likeness; so that, for instance, we talk of the king and of the image of the king, and not of two kings. And if this is the case, there is only one veneration of the image of Christ with Christ who is its prototype.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

2. If Christ, being invested with the principle (*logon*) of the prototype with respect to his own icon, is said to exist by nature, whereas his icon exists by position,[89] how can it be that the natural and the artificial exist at the same time? It is, in fact, not true that as soon as Christ was seen, his image was seen drawn beside him. Thus, since the two are not simultaneous, they cannot have the same veneration, since there is an interval of time after which the image was produced after Christ.

A solution to the above:

If every shadow inseparably follows its own body, and no one in his right mind could ever say that a body lacks its own shadow, but rather it is possible to see (*idein*) in the body the shadow that follows, and in the shadow the body that precedes, thus no one could say that Christ cannot be portrayed, if indeed in him there is a body that is defined by characteristics. Rather, we can see his image subsist (*hyphestōsan*) in Christ, while Christ can be seen in the image as prototype. From the fact that the two exist at the same time, it follows then that when Christ is seen, his image is also seen in potency (*dynamei*), and from him the image can be transposed and delineated in any material whatsoever.

Further:

3. Even if what exists in nature does not exist at the same time as what exists by position, as is the case instead with Christ and his own image, nevertheless, by way of the image's potential existence before it is produced artistically, it is always possible to see the image in Christ; just as, so to speak, it is always possible to see the image subsist in the body, even if the image is not given form by a radiation of light; therefore, it is not beyond reason to claim that Christ and his image exist simultaneously.

Further:

4. The prototype and the icon belong to the category of things that are related to each other (*tōn pros ti*), as what is double and what is half. The prototype, in fact, always implicitly carries with itself (*syneispherei*) its own image, of which it is the prototype; the double always implicitly carries with itself the half, with respect to which it is called double; if there were no prototype, there would be no image, and if there were no double, nothing would be thought to be half. But since these things exist at the same time, they are understood and they subsist at the same time. Since, then, no interval of time intervenes between the image and the prototype, the veneration of each is not distinct, but rather it is one and the same.[90]

Further:

5. The prototype and the image have their being, so to speak, in each other. When one is taken away, the other is taken away too; in the same way as when the double is removed, the half is removed as well.

If Christ, then, cannot exist unless his own image also exists in potency (*kata to dynamei*), even before being artistically produced, the image always subsists in the prototype; then the veneration of Christ is taken away by anyone who does not acknowledge that his own icon is also venerated in him at the same time (*symproskyneisthai*).

An objection from the iconoclasts:

6. "That which is similar in some respect may, however, not be similar in some other respect; thus, the image is similar to the prototype according to the likeness, but according to the nature it is not similar. Thus, the image is not wholly (*holon*) what the prototype is. But since this is the way things are, the veneration cannot be the whole and the same in both. If the veneration is not whole, it is foolish (*eōlon*) to claim that the veneration of both is the same."

A solution to the above:

Insofar as the image has a relationship to the prototype, according to the latter it also shares its own veneration according to the likeness, without bringing along to veneration the material in which it appears; this is indeed the nature of the image, that it should be identified (*tautizesthai*) according to the likeness of the prototype, but also that it should be distinguished according to the principle of the essence, from which also derives the fact that the same name is used for both (*homōnymia*). If, instead, it were wholly similar, our argument would fall through, and the image would be simply the prototype. However, it resembles the prototype according to the whole of its likeness but not according to the nature. Therefore, both are entitled to the same veneration based on the likeness (*homoiōtikē*).

Further, from a theological example:

7. Even if according to the essence the Son is equal to the Father, yet what is begotten is not equal to what is unbegotten, nor is that which is spirated (*to ekporeuton*); these properties that are contemplated with regard to the divine nature are distinct from what they share (*koinōnias*) with one another. But the divinity is one in the three Persons (*en tois trisi charaktērsin*),[91] as the veneration is one, and the latter in no way deflects from identity of nature because of the diversity in characteristics (*tē tōn idiotētōn eterotēti*). And the same goes for the image of the prototype, because, if in virtue of the difference of essence there is not the same veneration for both—as it is not the nature of the icon that is venerated, but the one who is seen to be represented in it—nonetheless, with respect to the identity of the hypo-

static likeness, the veneration is carried out in an identical manner (*tautizomenē*) on the basis on the one and whole relation (*empherria*) [of likeness] that exists in both. In the same way, in the case of the symbol of the cross and of the life-giving cross itself, the veneration of the symbol is not lessened by the comparison with the life-giving cross, but rather, it is set on an equal footing by its utter likeness with the prototype.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

8. If the image is in Christ as prototype even before it is artistically reproduced in any other material, then it would be unnecessary to delineate the image, as the latter can be sufficiently seen and venerated in him.

A solution to the above:

It is true that, even before the image of Christ is reproduced by artistic means, it inheres in him as a prototype. What, in fact, is not at all portrayed is not a human being but something monstrous (*amblōthridion*). And, yet, it is not possible to call something a prototype if its image has not been transferred onto some material. Therefore, since it is acknowledged that Christ possesses the characteristic (*logon*) of being prototype—as indeed is the case with everyone else—it is thus absolutely necessary that his image should be transferred from his imprint onto a material of some sort. Otherwise, if he were no longer seen and venerated through the production of an image, he would cease to be a human being.[92]

Further, by way of an example:

9. A seal is one thing, and its imprinted effigy (*apomagma*) is another. Nonetheless, even before the impression of the seal, the imprint is in the seal. A seal would not be a proper seal if it could not be impressed onto a material of some sort. Therefore, Christ also, if he were not impressed on some artificial image, would in this respect be dysfunctional and ineffective; even just to think this, is foolishness.

Further, by way of example:

10. If someone who sees the seal and the imprint sees in both a similar and unchanged form (*eidos*), then the imprint exists in the seal even before the impression. Thus, the seal displays its own propensity to be honored (*philotimia*) whenever it makes itself available to be impressed in many and different materials. In the same way, even if we believe that Christ's own image is in him inasmuch as he is in a human form, whenever we see this image materially depicted in different

manners, we celebrate his magnificence all the more. Indeed, the failure to proceed to a material imprint eliminates his existence in human form.

Further:

11. The image inheres and is seen and is venerated for the sake of the archetype, and the archetype [inheres and is seen and is venerated] for the sake of the image, not in virtue of an identical substance, but in virtue of a unity of likeness, according to which there is a single veneration for both, and the veneration is not distinct for either of the two natures.

Further, by way of example:

12. If the shadow cannot be separated from the body, but its subsistence always exists along with it (*symparyphestōsa*), even if the shadow does not always appear, in the same manner it is impossible that Christ's own image may be separated from him; in the same way as the shadow becomes more visible because of the rays of the sun, so does the image of Christ become more manifest to all, whenever it appears by imprinting itself in diverse materials.

An objection from the iconoclasts:

13. "As our Savior is now in the heavens, it is not seemly to erect an image; indeed, as the holy Apostle says, 'We walk by faith, and not by appearance (*dia eidous*).'"[95]

An answer to the above:

The term *appearance* (*eidos*) is used to make a distinction from what is general (*apo tou genous*), such as humanity in general; alternatively, the same term can be used to indicate the form of each one of us, whereby we differ from one another. But the Apostle does not speak of these here. It is rather to be understood that he uses "appearance" to mean his own vision (*autopsia*) of future realities—a vision that surpasses the figures of the present time. For when Paul says, "We walk by faith, not by appearance," he adds, "We are full of courage, and we would rather be away from the body, and dwell with the Lord."[96] And elsewhere he says, "For now we see as in a mirror and partially; but then we will see face to face. Now I know in part; then I will know fully as I was known. So faith, hope, and love remain."[97] Thus, Paul is saying that we walk by such a faith that we are actually able to see, as in a mirror, the truth of the things that are to come, face to face and without error. And in addition, to make it clear that the goal (*skopos*) of the Apostle was not to ban the portrayal of the physical appearance of Christ (*idea*) after his ascension to heaven, listen to what Paul says elsewhere, "O foolish Galatians, who has led you astray and convinced you no longer to follow the truth, when you could see Christ crucified in front of your very eyes?"[98] If our faith is such that we can behold Christ crucified, it would be all the more foolish not to portray Christ at all times. Indeed, if it were not possible to see perceptibly (*aisthētōs*) through a depiction (*perigraphē*) what is perceived intellectually because of its absence, even this intellectual vision would be lost.[99]

Epigram of Constantine, who copied the book of Theodore the Studite[100]

O noetic foundation of wise teaching,
Overflowing source of rightful dogmas,
As a true Father you were known to all mortals.
Do then protect me, Constantine, with your prayers.

SEVEN CHAPTERS AGAINST THE ICONOCLASTS

[by the same Theodore]

I

Against those who say that Christians make gods out of the images when they venerate (proskynountas) *the image of Christ, the Mother of God, or any of the saints:*

To "make gods" (*theopoiein*), if we consider the very composition of the term, is the action on the part of someone to turn into a god and to worship as such something that is not God, according to what the Apostle said, "And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the corruptible image of a man, of birds, of four-footed beasts and of serpents";[1] so, for instance, as far as the first type is concerned (it is indeed appropriate to assess those four types), Chronos and Zeus, Hera and Aphrodite, and a variety—as many as there are—who are similar to these in both genders; for the second type, the eagle, the gryphon, or any other one of the same nature of different types; for the third type, the cow or the goat, or any other one of the same nature of different types; finally, for the fourth type, the serpent, the lizard, or any other one of the same nature of different types. And the Greeks, the Barbarians, the Scythes, having turned their images into gods, "worshiped," as scripture says, "the creature instead of the creator,"[2] setting up many gods and goddesses that are dissimilar from each other and fight against each other; and of them none ever was, or is, or will be God.

And it is not the case that all those who portrayed something of what exists should be reproached, given that even Moses, to omit the others, represents the serpent and the Cherubim by way of images;[3] and

as he was about to construct the whole of the tabernacle, he was given an image of the latter by God. Indeed, scripture says, "Behold, you will make everything according to the type that was shown to you on the mountain";[4] but given that which was represented, they called it God and worshiped it, creating an endless series of a plurality of gods, because of their ignorance of the one God who truly exists, incorruptible and invisible. To them the blessed apostle says, "As then we are the progeny of God, we should not think that the divine should be similar to gold, or silver, or stone, or to a creation of art or of human skill."[5] This is the act by which those previously mentioned made gods of the icons. For those, instead, whom the Apostle was addressing, "there is one God the Father, who is the maker of all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things were made;"[6] and one Holy Spirit, in whom everything subsists; and it is not "to make gods" to erect the icon of the bodily imprint of Christ—perish the thought (*apage*)!—but rather to confess that he appeared in a form that is similar to us, as it is written, "While being in the form of God, he did not consider it a jealous treasure to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and becoming in the likeness of man, and he was found in the habit of man. And he humiliated himself, becoming obedient until death, and until death on the cross."[7] And his image indeed is not in the similitude of a corruptible man, which has been condemned by the Apostle, but it was in the similitude of man, as the Apostle himself said, though not a corruptible but an incorruptible one. Indeed, "his soul was not abandoned in hell," as the great Peter says, "nor did his flesh see corruption."[8] For this reason Christ, after becoming man, is not a mere human being—he is God. However, because he is like all other men, he is circumscribed according to the form of the body; and because he, alongside the Father and the Spirit, is different from all other creatures, he also remains uncircumscribed according to the essence of the divinity.

And then, how will the Word of the economy be understood, unless he, unlike the Father and the Spirit, apart from the set of properties that he has as Son, could also be represented in his corporeal form? Therefore, to paint and to venerate the image of Christ has nothing to do with turning the icons into gods—perish the thought, O foolish man! Indeed, we do not say that God has been "made," but rather that he has become incarnate; nor do we say that there are two Gods, but rather one in three hypostases. Nor, venerating the image,

do we impiously choose to worship the matter (*hylēn*) in which it is imprinted, but rather that very essence that is naturally in Christ, which imprinted itself into the matter like a seal. The artifacts, indeed, do not participate (*ametocha*) in the nature of the archetype within the boundaries of the art; they only display as in a mirror the relation (*emphereia*)[9] to the things of which they are representations. Thus, after a certain material has appeared in a cruciform shape, we should worship any material found in this manner. But enough foolishness! There is only one power in both, one glory, one adoration, as the great Basil claims,[10] as the relationship between image and prototype is not di-hypostatic, but mono-hypostatic.[11] With the exception of the difference (*diaphora*) of substance, the archetype and the image are one and the same, says the divine Denys.[12] And the same goes for the Mother of God. When we depict and venerate her image, we do not hold and worship her in the manner of the Gentiles (*Ellēnikōs*), as divine, but rather as the Mother of God. And the same goes for what concerns the saints; we do not honor and pay respect to many gods and goddesses, but to the one God and his servants. Through him and to him the honor of all flows out and returns.

Or does it not seem to you that the divine unguent was poured as a type of Christ? Is it not clear that the divine altar [lit. "table," *trapeza*] [is a figure] of the life-giving tomb? And that the cloth on the table [represents] the shroud on which and in which Christ was put to be buried? And that the priestly spear [stands for] the one spear on which and in which the side of the divine body was opened? And that the sponge [is a figure] of the one on which and in which he was forced to drink? And that the image of the cross [stands for] the actual tree of the cross that gave us life?[13] Consider all these things, or anything else that may be a divine antitype; whenever one worships one of these things at all, or an image is made to represent and honor Christ, say then that those who fabricate and worship are guilty of making gods (*theopoieisthai*). But this insanity is equal to the Gentiles who blurt out such things. The ones, indeed, at the incarnation confessed that God could be circumscribed even as he is uncircumscribable; the others instead, after the incarnation, continue to insist that he could not be circumscribed, even if he was circumscribable in terms of his body.

II

To those who wonder why in the Gospel nothing is written about the image of Christ:

It seems to me that these sophists ignore that, among the sayings of the Gospels, certain things are said and enunciated directly, and other things indirectly; this is the result of the Spirit's disposition (*oikonomēsantos*), that the [easy] access to edifying teachings would not be truly advantageous to the majority, but rather that through the hard work of research, we would reap more advantageous fruits, so that whatever until now was solid, from now on should not be taken away easily; and this with good reason. And if one were not to look, one would not find. Now we will give an illustration of this issue from a similar matter. Peter says to Christ as follows: "Lord, if it is you, command me to come to you on the water. And Jesus said: 'Come.' And getting off the boat Peter walked on the water, to come toward Jesus. Seeing then the strong wind, he was full of fear; and as he started to drown, he shouted saying, 'Lord, save me!' And immediately Jesus, having extended his hand, took hold of him. And he told him, 'O you of little faith, why did you doubt?' And as they climbed into the boat, the wind ceased."[14]

The text does not say that, after Christ took hold of him, Peter started again to walk on the water, but this is indicated indirectly. And no one would be able to claim with any reasonableness that Peter was taken by Christ through the air, or that Jesus took Peter by force until they ascended into the boat together. Now, let us revert to the topic, and observe with attention what is said. "Those came," scripture says, "who brought the drachma to Peter, and they said to him, 'Your master does not pay the two drachmas?' And Peter said, 'He does.' And as they entered into the house, Jesus came toward them, saying, 'What do you think, Peter? From whom do the kings of the earth receive a tribute or taxes? From their sons, or from outsiders?' And he said, 'From outsiders.' And Jesus then said, 'Thus the children are exempt. However, so as not to scandalize them, go to the sea, throw in a hook; take the first fish that will come up; and having opened its mouth, you will find a *statera*; take that and give it to them for me and for you.'"[15] Now the statement "for me and for you" indicates indirectly "instead of my image and your image." This is not only because the very pronouns of the persons (*prosōpōn*) are indicative (*dēlōtikai*) [of the

natures]—indeed, the persons are images (*eikones*)—but also because, apart from his or her own image, each one of those who are subject to a tribute offers in honor of the emperor an imperial image, which is called capital image; the head, indeed, is nothing else but an image; and all of this can be seen from the voice of the Lord, "Why do you tempt me? Bring me a *denarium*, so that I may see it. And they brought it to him. And he said to them: 'Whose image and whose inscription is this?' They told him: 'Of Caesar.' And as he answered Jesus told them: 'Give to Caesar what is of Caesar, and to God what is of God.'"[16] Thus Christ, having submitted himself in his humanity to all things that pertain to obedience, paid—like everybody else—the two drachmas for his own image; and the same happened with Peter and the *statera*, which amounts to two drachmas. The *statera*, no less than the drachma and the *denarium*, carried an image, no less than they carried and were marked by an inscription.

As, then, here we said it could be found in a metaphorical sense (*kata paralēpsin*), there we said that Peter walked over the waters, and it could not be otherwise; thus similarly the expression "for me and for you" should be interpreted to mean implicitly the image of Christ as well as the image of Peter; and this is clear to all who are not fools. I forego to say that of course the image inheres in Christ from the point of view of the nature (*physikōs*). Where the prototype is, it is proper that there should also be an image (*paragōgon*), as the prototype naturally expresses an image.

All these matters are indeed related and conjoint with one another. But apart from what was said above, there is still something else that I must say, which is that Jesus himself, in a hidden manner, shaped the image that he gave to Caesar as a tribute. How is that? Was it not accidental? While the tradition asserts that the fish swallowed the *statera* (indeed, this is the human point of view), it is perhaps more appropriate to suppose that the *statera* was created within the entrails of the fish with a mere word by the Divine Spirit, to which nothing is impossible. This, indeed, is appropriate to God. "Indeed he spoke," says scripture, "and they were made; he ordered, and they were created."[17]

III

To those who say that in heaven there is no human image, but the type of the cross, and therefore one must venerate the latter:

God, who knows all things before they are done, showing the mystery of his dispensation in the flesh before the foundation of the world, represented the cross in heaven by means of stars;[18] and on earth instead he represented himself in the shape of Adam, who, in the words of St. Paul, is a type of the one who has to come.[19] Truly, truly it was fitting that what was in heaven should be represented on earth, and what was on earth should be represented in heaven, so that it should appear to those who contemplate the heaven that, from now on, celestial things will be one with earthly ones.[20] And in any case, it was not appropriate that the image of a man should be seen in heaven, given that men independently of this were misled to worship the stars, much more so if they had seen a human image. For this reason the great Moses says, "Looking into the sky, and seeing the sun, and the moon, and the stars, and all the decoration of the heavens make sure that, being led into error, you will venerate and worship them."[21] Thus, even before the advent of Christ, among the other figures of the stars there was already a type of the cross, and it was not to be adored; as the prototype was despised, it was impossible that the image should not be despised as well.

However, now that Christ suffered on the archetype of this image out of love for humanity (*philanthrōpōs*), the image of the cross should be venerated and it has acquired a salvific power—even the one that can be seen in the heavens; and the same goes for the image of the cross of him who suffered for us, an image that, after its first manifestation, can be seen everywhere on earth, unless perhaps the hand of an iconoclast, anticipating the heresy of these modern enemies of images, has followed the example of the Jews.[22] Thus, the type of the cross should be considered worthy of veneration not because it was in heaven, but because of the life-giving wood when Christ was hung on it; similarly, the image of Christ should be worshiped not because of its prototype in Adam, but because of his incarnation from the Virgin.

IV

To those who say that the priest, when he blesses the children that are taken to him, should not use an image, but the type of the cross:

The priest stands between God and humanity, and whenever the priest invokes God, he is a symbol (*mimēma*) of Christ. The Apostle indeed says, "One is God, one is the mediator (*mesitēs*) between God and humanity, the man Jesus Christ."[23] As the priest is an icon of Christ, it is necessary that he should not use an image—in what way, then, should the image use an image of his own prototype?—but rather he should use the type of the cross, clearly imitating Christ. As, indeed, the latter "defeated the principalities and the powers with great confidence (*en parrhēsia*), triumphing over them" in the cross, as is written; in likewise manner, then, the priest accomplishes the salvation of the child by means of the type of the cross, as he himself is the type of Christ—indeed, the type and the icon are in a relation (*eis emphereian*); thus, for this reason the image of Christ is used, which is clearly the priestly dignity.[24]

V

To those who say that one can dispel disease and demons from oneself using the type of the cross but not the icon:

This problem has the same solution as the previous one. How, and in what way? Because each of the faithful, through the regeneration of baptism and the renewal by the Holy Spirit, is made to conform (*symmorphos*) to the image of Jesus who is God, according to what was said by the Apostle.[25] And in a different place, "Man does not have to cover his head, as he is the image and the glory of God."[26] And to those who are baptized, the prince of the Apostle says, "You are a chosen race; a royal priesthood; a holy people."[27] Thus, everyone can choose what kind of conduct to follow, according to one's understanding of what is conducive to salvation. And even if every faithful is a living icon, it is not useless that there should be icons of Christ [that are painted] on a table. The [image and likeness of Christ][28] that are brought about by the transformation accomplished in baptism concerns the internal person (*ton esō anthrōpon*). In what way, then, can Christ be made similar, in bodily form, to different individuals who

differ utterly from each other according to their appearance (*kat'idean*)? The icon of Christ is—and is said to be—the only one among images that are artificially made (*monē technētē*) that carries the features—in other words, the appearance—of the incarnate form as well as all other external characteristics.[29]

It is possible to see the same thing in the type of the life-giving cross. When the Apostle says, "I am crucified together with Christ,"[30] he is not said to have been crucified and suffered in a physical manner (*aisthētōs*) or using a real type of the cross; rather, this is said according to the interior person, and by way of an intellectual (*noētō*) cross, which, I say, is the power to mortify the passions. And this is even clearer from the saying of the Lord, "Take your cross, and follow me."[31] Thus both words, *cross* and *crucifixion*, have a dual meaning; the same goes for the icon of Christ, [which is] either the artificial one or the one taken up by the faithful in their own inner lives.

VI

To those who against the image of Christ oppose the famous saying of the Theologian: "What is venerated is not circumscribed":[32]

Those who say this say so because they do not understand the actual meaning of polyvalent terms, or rather do not want to understand how to act properly. Indeed, the word *venerated* (*septon*) is a polyvalent term that embraces quite a few different meanings. Thus, for instance, the term φῶς ("light") is understood in terms of the sun; but the term can also indicate a human being. Φώς ("a man") is indeed a human being.[33] If, then, I say that the term φῶς does not indicate a human being, it is true, because I refer to the sun. If, then again, I say that the term φώς indicates a human being, it is true, because I refer to the human being; and in itself the term may be confusing, because of its dual meaning. Similarly, then, the term *venerated* is correctly understood to be polyvalent, sometimes referring to uncircumscribability, sometimes to circumscribability. Indeed, about the Father, if one talks about the divine nature, it is possible to say that what is venerated is not circumscribed, in order to oppose those who would want to restrict the divine within circumscription. And it is true. But what was said before did not refer to the economy. One indeed is the rationale of theology, and one is the rationale of the economy, and speaking dogmatically it

is not appropriate to affirm the same in both contexts. It so happens, for instance, that even the divine Cyril sometimes refers to the hypostasis by the term *physis* and sometimes by the term *hypostasis*, as the term has a dual meaning.[34] And since Gregory of Nazianzos knows quite well that what is circumscribed can be venerated, he himself says, "Worship (*proskynēson*) the manger, through which you, who lacked reason (*alogos*), were fed by the Word (*hypo tou Logou*)."[35] And what must be worshiped, in the same way it must be venerated. I forego to talk of the Body of the Lord; is it not circumscribed? Who can contradict this? So then? Is it not worthy of veneration? Even the stones will shout it. And what will you say then of the life-giving cross? Of the antitype? Of the altar? Of the holy table? Of the most holy Gospel, or of any other sacred implement? And perhaps the very relics of the saints, are not all of them circumscribed? Of course they are, and in the same way they also are to be venerated, like the icon of Christ; the fathers of the Sixth Holy Council testify together to that in the passages of their writings where they treat of the holy icons.[36]

VII

To those who against the image of Christ oppose that famous saying by St. Gregory: "If anyone venerates the creature, even if he does that in the name of Christ, he commits idolatry":

This saying was directed against the Arians, who claimed that the Son of God was a creature (*ktisma*).[37] But we, when we venerate the image of Christ, do so because we have the intention of venerating Christ himself in an orthodox manner, in virtue of the one veneration that is directed to both natures, and which is not divided in accordance with the distinction (*diaphora*) of the essences,[38] but is on the contrary unified because of the unity of the one hypostasis; we do not venerate a creature—perish the thought!—because Christ is not a creature, even if there is in him an element that is created, because the latter, as they say, takes second rank to what is higher. Do not consider any longer the material from which it is distinguished intellectually; even if in itself—and I say it again—as through a mirror it is seen through an image. And if you claim not to understand this, you have only the eyes of the body, while you are similar to the pig, to which God and the [eternal Word] prohibited that the words of truth, which are similar to pearls, should be thrown.

SOME QUESTIONS POSED BY THE [SAME] THEODORE TO THE ICONOCLASTS,

…who do not want that our Lord Jesus Christ should be depicted according to his corporeal form.[1]

I. If Christ is out of (*ek*) two natures and is in (*en*) two perfect (*teleiais*) natures,[2] please do say according to which nature he cannot be painted: according to the one which assumed, or according to the one which was assumed? And if it was according to the first, could he not be painted according to the other? Or vice versa? If, then, according to both natures, in what way could this be, if one perfect nature and one perfect property were not composed out of two?[3] And let us then assume neither that he could be painted, nor that he could not be painted, but rather simultaneously that he could and that he could not (*graptoagraptos*), being composed of half natures (*ex hēmiseōn*) but not being complete according to either. And if this were the case, in what way, then, could Christ not be different in nature (*heteroousios*) from the Father and from us? He would be different from us because we can be painted, as we are made of a body; he would be different from the Father also, as the Father can never be circumscribed because of the simplicity of his nature.

II. As the properties of each nature cannot be changed, circumscription applies to the humanity of Christ; if Christ could not be represented according to his humanity, this would entail surely that this humanity had been moved away; and if it had been moved away, where had it taken residence? Perhaps into the nature of his own divinity? And if this is the case, the Trinity received an addition, assuming a property that it is not connatural (*asymphyes*) to it,[4] which is impossible. If, then, it did not go there, where should it be? And if it disappeared, by necessity the relevant nature should also disappear,

despite the fact that in the confession of faith one cannot be separated from the other.

III. What is uncircumscribable is either of the same order (*homostoichon*) as what is circumscribable, or it is of a different order (*heterostoichon*).[5] If what is uncircumscribable is of the same order as what is circumscribable, God the Word is of the same essence as the flesh that has been assumed, even as he is uncircumscribed; and this would be the case because the properties of the same order belong to the same nature in whatever is undivided. If, instead, what is uncircumscribable is of a different order from what is circumscribable, given that the Logos is of an utterly different substance from the flesh, we must conclude that, according to the flesh, the Logos is circumscribed, but, according to the substance of his humanity and to the substance of his divinity—in other words, according to the two orders of their respective properties—he is simultaneously circumscribable and uncircumscribable, in the same way, of course, as he is seen and not seen, or he can be touched and cannot be touched.[6]

IV. If the properties of material and composite things are also material and composite, in which way, then, will Christ be uncircumscribed according to the corporeal form? What is uncircumscribed is immaterial and simple, but the body instead is material and composite. Indeed, it is necessary that every property should be similar to the nature [to which it belongs]; and a diversity (*allotriotēta*) based on a dissimilarity of this kind (*heterotēta*) could in no way be admitted.[7] And then, if the body of Christ were not circumscribed, the properties of his humanity would be different from their underlying nature; and this is impossible, as the immaterial (*aulon*) cannot be identical to the material, and the simple cannot be identical to the composite. Indeed, in terms of the body, Christ is not uncircumscribable; there cannot be any difference between things that are not different, or composition in things that are simple.

V. If Christ is God and man, the human nature is not endowed with the same nature with which God is endowed; indeed, clearly, it is impossible that Christ should be circumscribed by the same property in virtue of which he is uncircumscribed, as each property differs from the other; and neither the natures, nor the properties that inhere in them, can come into the communion that exists in the identity (*koinōnia*) of one substance. If this is the case, in what way, then,

will Christ, who consists of two natures, not be the one who can be portrayed and cannot be portrayed?[8]

VI. Is God seen by those who are on this earth by means of the form that can be represented, or by means of the form that cannot be represented? If by means of the form that cannot be represented, the latter is certainly invisible as well; and if one is of the same order as the other, this also applies to what cannot be circumscribed and what cannot be seen. But then, how can the disciples say, "We have seen the Lord?"[9] Thus [Christ was seen in that form] that can be represented, even if he remained invisible in terms of the divine nature. And if indeed he could be seen in that form that can be represented, who then will dare call the circumscribed form uncircumscribable, unless he were to reach the apex of folly?

VII. If we were to say that Christ were only circumscribable, this would amount to stripping him of his divinity, which is characterized by uncircumscribability; it is also clear that if we were to say that he is only uncircumscribable, this would amount to stripping him of his humanity, which is characterized by circumscribability; and both claims are absurd. And [similarly absurd are the claims] of Paul of Samosata, who deliriously said that Christ was a mere man and not God; or of Mane the Persian, who stupidly said that Christ was merely God and not man.[10] Consider, then, how we are going from one abyss to another.[11] Whichever, then, of these two impious opinions you may choose to flee, as if you were made of parts, by necessity, being in the middle, you will embrace the opposite opinion. On the one hand, if you say that you do not wish to follow Paul of Samosata, why do you follow the Manicheans, thereby failing to circumscribe Christ as if he were just the incorporeal Word? This is something that Paul of Samosata rejects. On the other hand, if you say that you do not wish to follow the Manicheans, why do you say with Paul of Samosata that Christ is [merely] an embodied man? This is something that the Manicheans reject. Thus, if you follow the Manicheans, you end up following Paul of Samosata, and vice versa.

VIII. If you confess Christ both in divinity and in humanity, and you are unshakable in your conviction, why, then, do you refuse to say that, in certain respects, Christ can be circumscribed, and, in other respects, he cannot be circumscribed? Indeed, he is known (*gnōrizomenos*) in virtue of the property of each nature: by means of the property in virtue of which he is God, he goes beyond circumscription, as

well as sight and comprehension; by means of the property in virtue of which he is man, he falls under the purview of circumscription, as well as sight and quality; unless it is only by voice that you confess that Christ is both in humanity and divinity, while for other reasons of convenience you claim that Christ is without body, and thus uncircumscribable.[12]

IX. Do you not think that what is simple and what is composite are different things, or do you think that they are the same? If the former, you will say with us that Christ is entirely circumscribed, and entirely uncircumscribed, as he is from both. Indeed, in the properties that are opposed to each other, one can see the nature of both the aspects of Christ—I mean, the simple and the composite, the divinity and the humanity. As in the example of the fire and the water, fire does not go downward, nor does water go upward; dryness is not humidity, nor is humidity dryness.[13] Thus, circumscribability is different from the inability to be represented (*agraphia*), and the inability to be represented is different from circumscribability. Indeed, one is opposed to the other as much as possible by a natural opposition, which is much greater in this third case than in the previous two. If, instead, you think that Christ was only uncircumscribable, why then do not you affirm the latter? And even if you do not say that, you will say that the divinity and the humanity will be one nature that will be simple and composite at the same time (*haplosyntheton*), as if, with Severus, you were affirming in a mixed manner (*sygchytikōs*) the existence of aqueous fire (*hydropyron*).[14] The structure of the nature (*ho tēs physeōs logos*)[15] is proved to be unique from the uniqueness of its set of properties.

X. If the negations are opposed to the affirmations, and they are neither conceptually nor terminologically identical, circumscription then is an affirmation; no circumscription is a negation; and Christ is from both natures, in his divinity and in his humanity; and he has the properties of the natures in full; and among these properties, there are some that are in opposition to each other, and they are not mixed into one; rather, they are distinct, and they exist in correspondence to the duality of the natures; and from these, Christ can be known (*nenoētai*) to us, and called circumscribed and not circumscribed. If this is not how matters stand, but he is only uncircumscribable, then things that are distinct (*ta akrata*) are mixed; and things that have different names are called by the same name; and walking and not walking can be understood and called in the same way; and the same, then, for discussing and not discussing; and existing and not existing; and being circumscribed and not being circumscribed; all of which is utter foolishness.

XI. From the union of uncircumscribed and circumscribed, O good ones, it is impossible that something only uncircumscribed should ensue; similarly, it is impossible that from the union of divinity and humanity should emerge someone who is God alone. If indeed the natures are united (*enōtheisai*) according to the hypostasis, they do not undergo change into each other; nor did they change their own appellations; even after the union in one person (*prosōpō*),[16] they preserve the duality in terms of the realities (*tois pragmasi*) and in terms of their appellations; and in the same way, their properties are maintained unchanged, and their natural quality has not undergone any modification; nor did they forego their distinction in terms of the names; rather, [the natures] remain inviolate (*alōbētoi*) in Christ; from which (*aph'ōn*) he is both circumscribed and uncircumscribed, despite the fact that you reject this in an impious manner.

XII. If, as St. Epiphanios says,[17] all the things that are in man are man; and if at his coming, the Only Begotten assumed everything that is human; so that what is fully (*teleiōs*) in man should also, being God, be turned into the fullness of salvation, having let go of nothing human; if he were not circumscribed in terms of the body, he would have let go of something, and not just of something minor, but of the most important and particular characteristic—if truly the most important characteristic of humanity is the fact that its bodily imprint may be represented; is it not the case, O men, as the same saint [Epiphanios] says in the thirty-second chapter of his treatise on the heresies, that whoever denies that Christ can be represented is akin to whoever denies that Christ took flesh? And, of course, even the blessed Sophronios casts anathemas against the latter in his synodical letter.[18]

XIII. To those who are opposed in an even more tenacious manner and claim that, in the act of representing Christ, Christ ends up being divided into two Sons, as Nestorius had said, one must respond that this is not dividing Christ, but rather [one must say] what is most necessary to know.[19] As in the realm of theology, what is proper to the hypostasis does not divide the one nature of the divinity but may be ascribed to each hypostasis accordingly while having everything in common from the point of view of the nature; in the same way, on the

contrary, from the point of view of the economy, what is proper to the natures does not divide the one hypostasis of the Word of God but may be ascribed to each nature accordingly while having everything in common from the point of view of the hypostasis. If, indeed, in the act of circumscription what is proper to the human nature were to induce a division, there would also be a division in the one nature that is proper to the One who is *Unbegotten*, the One who is *Begotten*, and the One who is *Spirated*. And yet the nature is not divided; even these three are different from one another. Nor in this sense could the uncircumscribability of the divinity and the circumscribability of the humanity divide the one hypostasis of Christ either, even if they are distinct from each other.

XIV. If, from the incarnation of God, the Word, it is not possible to infer that the Father and the Spirit also took flesh, even if the Trinity is undivided according to the nature, so then, from the circumscription of God the Word according to the humanity, is it possible to infer that the divinity is simultaneously circumscribed as well, even if the latter according to the hypostasis is undivided from the flesh, as the conjunction (*synapheia*) of the natures therein does not confuse the hypostases, nor does the identity of the hypostasis remove the natures from their proper limits?[20]

XV. If Christ because of the divinity cannot be represented like us, so similarly according to the humanity he is not uncircumscribed like the Father; and he has let go of both, or rather has changed the properties one with the other, being circumscribed as God and being uncircumscribed as man. If it is true that having everything that the Father has, he also has uncircumscribability, then clearly, having everything that humanity has, he also has circumscribability if he is perfect from both sides, and not only partially according to one of the parts.

LETTER OF THE SAME THEODORE TO HIS OWN FATHER PLATO ABOUT THE VENERATION OF THE SACRED IMAGES

We ourselves are full of consolation as we address our sacred head. What indeed can be more enticing for a child than to address one's father, and indeed one of such quality and achievement, whose virtue is sung by many cities, regions, and islands; such is my beloved Father, even if the fruit is not similar to the tree, because of the sterility of my unworthiness. But you have been set up for us as the norm of piety; and not for us alone, but also for those who choose to lead a pious life, strive for worthiness, and let themselves be encouraged to run the good course. It is already a long time since your holiness asked me to offer an argument about the way in which one must venerate the blessed icon of Christ, not because you did not know how to go about it, but because in this way you wished to elicit my word, which until then had remained silent (*ton alogon mou logon*). Until now, however, I did not have the opportunity to respond. Having now remembered, it is opportune that I should set out to accomplish, with the help of your sacred prayers, whatever has been ordered to me by one such as you. I will do so even if, probably, I talked enough elsewhere about this topic.

To begin, every artificial image is a likeness (*homoiōsis*) of the one of whom it is the icon, and in itself it mimetically displays the imprint of its archetype, as Denys—expert in divine matters—says: truth in similitude; the archetype in the icon; one in the other, according to the difference in substance.[1] Thus, the one who venerates the icon clearly venerates the one whom the icon displays. Indeed, he did not venerate the substance of the icon, but the one who is depicted in it; nor indeed, as far as the veneration is concerned, did he separate the archetype from the icon. By the way of the

likeness, indeed, the image is the same as the archetype. Thus, for example, even the great Basil says that even the image of the king is called king, and there are not two kings.[2] Thus, the power is not split, and the honor is not divided. In the same way as the principle and power to which we are subject is one, so also the honor (*doxologia*) that is given by us is one, and not many. Thus, the honor given to the icon passes over to the archetype.[3] If, then, it passes to the archetype, there are not different venerations, but the honor and the veneration are one and the same, in the same way as what is venerated and the prototype for the icon are one and the same.

The natural image and the artificial image are two different realities. On the one hand, the first one does not have a natural distinction from its cause but a hypostatic one, like the Son from the Father; one, indeed, is the hypostasis of the Son, and one is that of the Father, even if their nature is clearly one. The other one, on the other hand, has a natural distinction but not a hypostatic one, like the icon of Christ in relation to Christ. The nature of the material representation and the nature of Christ are indeed different ones, but the hypostasis is not different—rather, it is one, and the one of Christ and the one that is represented in the icon are the same. Again, the same divine Basil says: What, then, the icon is mimetically, the same, then, the Son is naturally; and in the same way as there is similitude according to the form in artificial matters, so there is a unity in the communion of the divinity in terms of the divine and simple (*asynthetou*) nature.[4] Note then the difference: regarding the natural image and the cause, namely, the Son and the Father, given that there is one nature, there is also one veneration according to the identity of the nature, not of the hypostasis; since, given that there is only one nature, we also recognize one veneration and honor (*doxologian*) to the Holy Trinity in three hypostases, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Regarding the artificial image and the archetype, namely, Christ and the icon of Christ, given that there is only one hypostasis in Christ, one only, then, is the veneration, clearly in virtue of the identity of the one hypostasis, not because of the diversity of the natures of Christ and of the icon. If, indeed, we say that the veneration of the icon in relation to the prototype is one according to the identity of the hypostasis, but is also one according to the identity of the nature, we no longer acknowledge the difference between the image and the one who is represented. In the same way as there is one hypostasis,

should we, then, say that the icon and Christ himself share the same nature? We would fall into the polytheism of the Gentiles, turning into a god (*theopoiountes*) the whole matter that has been imprinted with the image of Christ. And, thus, we would excite the tongue of the iconoclasts to claim with reason that we, who venerate one God in three hypostases, actually venerate and honor many gods. If, on the contrary, someone were to say that the veneration of the icon in relation to the archetype [is not the same]—neither according to the identity of the hypostasis, nor according to the identity of the natures—clearly this person would divide the power and separate the glory of the archetype from the image; thus, venerating the image of Christ, he would clearly fall into idolatry, practicing not one but two distinct forms of veneration. This is what the iconoclasts strive to demonstrate, concluding from here, as is clearly manifest (*ōs to eikos*), that Christ cannot be contained in the flesh; the same goes for those who are seen impiously to claim that God manifested himself to those on earth only in appearance and imagination.

But may the impiety of both remain buried in its own darkness; the true faith of the Christians, as was said before, in the same way as it acknowledges one veneration of the Holy Trinity in virtue of the shared character (*koinōnia*) of the divinity, so then, in relation to the icon of Christ, it acknowledges one and the same veneration according to the identity of the hypostasis of Christ. Indeed, [the hypostasis] that is venerated is the same as the one that is represented. If it were not an icon, if it is separated and divided in terms of the honor from the prototype, it would happen to be some item with its own hypostasis (*idioupostaton*). And thus, in the end (*loipon*), in terms of the veneration of the icon of Christ, [it is important to acknowledge] that the veneration and the honor of the much-hymned and blessed Trinity is one, and only one.

But perhaps someone else could say: given that veneration is identical with adoration, it so happens that the icon of Christ is adored together with the Holy Trinity. But it seems that whoever says this would not know the difference in veneration, because we venerate the saints but do not worship them; according to the law of God, we also venerate [our] rulers but do not worship them. Thus, this person should learn that the veneration is not addressed to the substance of the icon; this is alien (*ektopon*) [to us], and [rather] it is typical of those who adore the creation instead of the Creator. On the contrary,

as Christ is venerated in the image of Christ, the matter of the icon remains utterly outside the Christ who is venerated in it; and this is so in virtue of the likeness that is proper to the hypostasis of Christ and that is distinct from his physical body, even if seen in it. And it seems to me that this fits with the example of the mirror; indeed, it is possible to say that the face of the viewer appears in the mirror, and yet the likeness remains outside the actual physical mirror. And if anyone can discern his own image in the mirror, one would not include the actual mirror in the conception of one's own image; one does not come close to the mirror because of the object in itself, but because of one's likeness that is represented in the mirror. Indeed, this likeness adheres to the material of the mirror; of course, as soon as the mirror is moved away, the image immediately moves away from it, as it does not inhere in the actual material of the mirror. The same can be said then of the material of the sacred image; if the likeness that is seen in the material of the image and toward which the veneration is directed were to disappear, the material of the image would remain without veneration, because it would not have anything in common with the likeness.

Let us now consider a ring that is imprinted with the image of the emperor, and let the image be imprinted in wax, or in pitch, or in clay. The seal will indeed be one and the same, without any difference in all the materials. The latter, however, are different one from the other; the seal did not remain the same in virtue of the distinct materials but rather in virtue of the fact that it does not have anything in common with the materials. The seal did remain in the ring, but conceptually it is distinct from the materials in which it was imprinted. And the same applies also to the likeness of Christ, whenever the latter is imprinted in any material you can think of, as the likeness of Christ does not have anything in common with the material in which it is imprinted; rather, the likeness remains in the hypostasis of Christ, of which it is also a property (*idion*). And to speak in a straightforward manner, the icon of Christ as such is not the object of adoration (*ou latreuetai*); rather, in the image, Christ is venerated (*proskynoumenos*); and veneration is due to the icon because of the identity of the hypostasis of Christ, despite the difference of the substance of the icon.

Thus, in this way—or at least so it seems to me—the veneration of the image of Christ is confirmed (*epereidomenon*)[5] by the teaching of the holy fathers; if this veneration is eliminated, the economy of

Christ is equally eliminated, and if [the image] is not venerated, the veneration of Christ is similarly eliminated.

And for this reason, divine Father, it is fitting to approach [the image of Christ] and to venerate it with fear and with devotion, as the veneration moves over to Christ; it is also appropriate to believe that the divine grace is present in the image, and that the grace of sanctification is transmitted to those who approach the image with faith. Moreover, concerning the type of the life-giving cross, and the image of the most holy Mother of God and of all the saints, every sacred (*hagiastikē*) veneration of the icons—it is possible to ascend to God by means of the prototypes represented in these images. And for this reason one and undivided is the veneration of adoration (*latreutikē*) of the holy and consubstantial (*homoousiou*) Trinity; it is because of the Trinity that other forms of veneration (*hai diaphoroi proskynēseis*) ultimately exist,[6] and it is to the Trinity that all other veneration ultimately tend. If, then, because of ignorance I said something erroneous, by being either too concise or too verbose, as a good Father, do deign yourself to correct it or to integrate it or to eliminate it—praying and praying again because of my wretchedness that I should be able to understand correctly, and to speak without procuring offense, and to act in an irreprehensible manner.

REFUTATION AND SUBVERSION (BY THE SAME THEODORE) OF THE IMPIOUS POEMS

...by John, Ignatios, Sergios, and Stephen, modern adversaries of Christ, first by way of poems that have the same number of lines as the letter of their own names, and then by way of a separate oration that lays out the blasphemous argument of those who are lacking in piety.[1]

JOHN

Acrostic: The Passion of Christ Is the Hope of John[2]

The divine authors praise Christ with a golden effigy,
Without considering lowly matters, and in accordance with the speech of the prophets.[3]
The speech of both divine authors and prophets rests on nothing but **hope** in God.
Both of them openly despise the ever recurrent (*palindromon*) error
Of the painters of icons (or of the shadows [*skias*] of those who paint) as hateful to God—
And those who agree with these teachings (the emperors), full of enthusiasm,
Raise crosses in a splendid manner and with a pious discernment.[4]

IGNATIOS

Acrostic: The Glory of Ignatios Is to Acknowledge the Cross

O Word, so as to strengthen among the mortals the worship of God,
And in order to grant a clearer understanding of yourself,
You established by law that the **cross** alone would be represented.
You also chose that out of an artificial material,
The cross may also be painted on the walls, and as it was in the past, so it should be now.
So then the great emperors raise the very cross
As a harbinger of victory.

SERGIOS

Acrostic: Sergios Raised the Cross as Salvific

Moses openly defeated the powers of evil raising a type,
And with the aid of a type he crushed the enemy.[5] In the same way now the **cross**,
Glory of the faithful, stops the strong torrent of error.
In a similar way, then, the creation of art, not unlike a hidden arrow
Thrown with an evil intent, penetrates deeply into the souls.
This is how their wound is felt by those who are subject to Christ.[6]

STEPHANOS

Acrostic: The Glory of Stephanos Is to Acknowledge the Cross

As support of the faithful, and as something that is worthy of divine veneration,
You gave us, O Word, the salvific **cross**, the life-giving type of the passion.

Indeed, you chose to suppress as an error
The earlier divine prohibition against representation,
And this is the law that everyone is mandated to follow:
Always worship that cross, to which you were hung, and
through which you redeemed us.

Into the Bronze Door Under the Cross[7]

As the emperor would not allow that Christ should be painted
Through an image without speech, and devoid of spirit,
Using earthly matter which the scriptures condemn
Leo with his son, the new Constantine,
Impressed the happy type of the cross
Glory of the faithful, on the doors of the palace.[8]

THE ORTHODOX

Where the acrostic is carried right in the middle of each verse, and the pincer (*syllabē*) is not divided.[9]

Acrostic: It Is Praiseworthy to Erect Pictures of Christ

May Christ be praised, he who is simultaneously God and man,
Blossom of the Virgin, and light that illumines the world,
His image, **painted**,[10] dissolves all error,
And defeats the armies of those who claim that
The veneration of images is nothing but worship of created
things, which is utter impiety.
Let him perish then, whoever refuses
To acknowledge Jesus in the form that is common to all mortals.

Acrostic: It Is Appropriate to Praise the Virgin, as She Is the One Who Was Expected

Having given birth in a divine manner, without the use of seed,
From you, as from a new heaven, the light came forth,
The **praise**[11] of the Cherubim, the cause which precedes
them,[12]

Decreasing the night of every ancient error.
You embraced him, and now you carry him as he is
painted,
Resplendent with a divine beauty in your image,
As Lord, and as your true Son.

Acrostic: It Is Appropriate for Theodore to Praise Christ

God, before the assumption of the flesh, was in a form that
could not be depicted.
But now that he is flesh, he can tolerate delineation (*tēn*
pographēn).
It is then clear that the blossom, which she who is blessed
brought forth as **Christ**,
Can now be depicted in her likeness (*kat'aulēn*) by anyone
To whom it is given that he should be able to see the Son of
Mary,
Brushing aside him who is endowed with the light of reason,
And yet acts in opposition to the divine plan.[13]

Acrostic: The Cross Is Going to Bring Miracles to Theodore

Do me the favor of pausing to reflect on the wondrous tree,
which is joined to God,
And which I acknowledged to be a power that could overcome
Hades
(the **cross** talks clearly of the passion of Christ).
I do indeed sprinkle around a dew (*drosos*),[14] which
accomplishes truly admirable feats,
So that it may again irrigate the world with its flowing drops;
Showing its powers, and forgetting none of the things that
pertain to eternal life;
Whose exact number it is impossible to describe.

Christ must be painted: do not err, O deceivers;[15]
As he appeared not according to the divinity, but according to
the human flesh,
Given that he must be known according to both natures,
So that he cannot be painted [in terms of what] he received

from the Father, but he can be painted in terms of what he received from the mother.
Lacking in no property from either nature,
And in either case he is perfect.

In what way, if he were lacking in any property at all,
Could then the Word who became man be perfect at all?
Truly he would be missing in something, if he could not be painted,
And not even in something irrelevant, but in one whole nature;
Especially as we consider that what was most visible in him was the mortal form.
You must realize that if you deny it with an evil counsel, or abolish it as an error,
You are calumniating and denying Christ.[16]

From the same:

Acrostic: Christ Is Peace[17]

The error of the idols disappeared in front of the image of Christ,
A double-edged sword destroyed it: behold,
The image of light that destroys darkness
Is overshadowed by the cross: he carries a sword in the back.[18]
And with the cross, indeed the king of all
Defeated the forces of the ruler of darkness, taking us up from below,
Placing us above, and giving us celestial glory.

From the same:

Acrostic: Praise to the Mother of God

As God has appeared in the flesh, as flesh he should also be portrayed.
Having been seen in the world of matter, he wants to be seen in a material manner.

He must be celebrated by hymns, through which it might be possible to see him.
The fact that he is the Savior should also be clearly visible.
The one who goes beyond the vision of the Cherubim, as God,
Letting go of himself (*katheis eauton*), he takes the form of a servant.[19]
O prodigy! In what way it is made present when he is depicted!

From the same:

Acrostic: An Iambic Eruption[20]

Behold, Christ is here depicted, indeed, even as he is the king of all,
In no way he differs from the mortals. In no way then should
The corrupt mind deviate from this teaching.
So that everyone should know that he is a mortal (*meropa*), and that is he is not beyond the flesh,
He is a perfect witness of himself as he is depicted,
And thereby he is shown to be utterly similar to us.

From the same:[21]

Christ is visually depicted as flesh, even if he is the Word,
Anyone who has tasted the divine mysteries should communicate them to the minds that are wise.
He comes indeed carrying the human image (*ton andromorphon eikona*),[22]
By means of that, through the divine power, he defeats
Every shadow, which deceives the mortals.
From now onward, doing what is just, the one who carries the scepter (*skēptrokratōr*)[23]
Swept away in this manner all foolish traps.

From the same:

Christ here depicted shines again.
Not of course in opposition to the symbol of the cross.
Indeed, he carries that forever on his head—

But so as to dissolve the heresy that deceives the people.
And having slaughtered this heresy with the word, as if with a word of judgment,
The Lord most powerful has won.

A Response to John's Poem[24]

The divine authors praise Christ with a golden effigy,
Without considering lowly matters, and in accordance with the speech of the prophets.

I. The divine authors describe Christ with words, O noble man; and you, in your perverse nature, call this speech a "golden effigy." However, they did not do so only on the basis of what the prophets had spoken; rather, they had seen everything with their own eyes (*oikeia autopsia*): "What we have found," says scripture, "with our eyes, that we have seen, and our hands have touched the Word of life."[25] Thus, it is not at all the case that they were avoiding "earthly matters"; rather, raising the eyes of their minds to what they themselves had seen, they contemplated Christ reclining in the manger; others saw him carried by the bent arms of his mother; and some saw him sitting near the well, some walking over the sea, some descending toward Capharnaum, and some ascending toward the mountain.[26] And who could count the innumerable works, which in many ways it is possible to see, and which in no way supplant the mysteries that are above this world? For this reason your claim is false, no matter how you consider it.[27]

Both of them openly despise the ever-recurrent error
*Of the painters of icons (or of the shadows [*skias*] of those who paint) as hateful to God.*[28]

II. As things that are absurd are wont to follow things that are absurd, these second things follow accordingly. Whom do you call the makers of shadows, if not the painters of sacred images (*zōographōn*, lit. "the writers of life")? What then do you call the recurrent error, if not [the injunction] that Christ should be painted? O tongue that is enemy of Christ! And why, then, are we talking of a recurrent error? Surely, you will say, because it is similar to the making of idols. Let us then return to the earlier dispensation, when Christ did not rule over us, nor was there any manifestation of the Trinity, and an image of Christ depicted before his descent into the flesh (*pro sōmatōseōs*) would have been an idol. But if this is the case, the Hebrews won, those who took their name from Christ are in error, and it is necessary to follow the custom of the Jews. The heavens were shaken by this, and they were greatly horrified, says the Lord.[29]

John did two evil things: he called Christ an idol, and he lied, saying that such practice was hateful—indeed, that it was hateful to God. But things do not stand this way, O injurer of Christ! The error is not truth, and the community of the Christian faithful, by whom Christ was seen in human form, and which continues to paint Christ and to worship him until the present, has not turned toward idolatry. Indeed, he was seen so that he could be painted, and so that those who worshiped the idols may worship Christ visually represented in human form.

Now, "The Lord is God, and he illumined us."[30] As long as this is the case, idolatry will cease. However, we are close to the coming of the Antichrist, of which you are the forerunner; and the Antichrist will seek to convince the people to remain mired in error, so that "the man of sin may be revealed, the son of perdition, who is in opposition, and is glorified above everything that is said by God, or is worshiped."[31] It is for this reason that the image has to be made the object of disrespect: so as to deny the prototype himself.[32] So, if you please, take hold of yourself; yours indeed is the false error, born indeed of the false council,[33] then interrupted, and now again spilling forth as of from a fountain of mud.[34]

III. But, John says, [this practice is] hateful to God. Surely, he is not talking from God;[35] he is howling from the mouth of the devil. This practice is not hateful to God, O madman, but it is most pleasing to him! Why, then, should God become what he hates that should be reproduced? There is nothing among the properties of humanity that cannot be portrayed in an image. Man has nothing else first in his properties but what is of the type that can be painted. If someone cannot be represented in an image, that is not a human being, but an abortion (*ektrōma*).

IV. Therefore, which of the things of which you so ineptly speak do you think actually belong to Christ, who because of his great goodness agreed to become man in all things? In what way could he cleanse similar with similar, as the theologian says,[36] if he could not be described in a way that is utterly similar? All that is left to you is to oppose the theologian, and claim that he cleansed the dissimilar with

the dissimilar. In what way, then, is it possible to believe that he took flesh from the most holy Virgin, if he could not be represented in it? It is indeed necessary that the one who is given birth should be identical to the one who gives birth; thus, every son is the image of the one who gives birth [the father], and nothing that is present in the nature of the mother should be missing from what is carried by the one who is generated. And one of the first characteristics that are present is the portrayability (*exeikonêsis*) of the bodily character. If, indeed, the body could not be portrayed, the body would not come [from the Virgin] but from some other source, and then of what should it be made? Perhaps it should be celestial, as Valentinos says; or angelic, and so it should have no quantity or quality, it could not be touched or caressed, and it could not eat or sleep.[37] These things and many more should then be ascribed to the body that cannot be represented. In this way, then, the Redeemer did not pay the price (*timêma*) for us, as the divine Basil says, nor did he defeat the kingdom of death by himself.[38] If, indeed, it was other that was defeated by death, then it was something else that was assumed by the Lord (and how could it be otherwise, given that he cannot be depicted in a manner that is equal to us), nor did death cease to rule over the things that belong to it, nor would the sufferings of the divine bearer of the flesh have been of any advantage to us. And so, then, he did not kill sin in the flesh; we, who died in Adam, were not given life back in Christ; what fell was not transformed; what was broken was not restored; what had been distorted by the deceit of the serpent was not returned to God. All these things are eliminated, then, by those who claim that Christ came with a body that cannot be depicted; this is ultimately what their speech entails. Distance yourself from error, O man, if you please, and learn that truly Christ became man and that the divine writers claim that he can be described both by words and by images. Some, indeed, praise him with words, others represent him using paintings, and, in both cases, this leads to the same truth. What, indeed, the word of history represents by hearing, graphic art silently represents by imitation. The same divine inspiration is present. And again, someone is shouting: May Christ—the one who rewards struggles—be depicted in a painting. He indeed is honored, who is the subject of the painting that is honored; and similarly, he indeed is dishonored, who is the subject of the painting that is dishonored. The honor of the icon,

indeed, ascends (*anabainei*) to the prototype, and the same also with the dishonor.[39] Behold, then, who is the one whom they despise.

Those who agree with these teachings (the emperors), full of enthusiasm,
Raise crosses in a splendid manner and with a pious discernment.

V. What are you saying? That the cross is honored, as Christ is despised? Is it not the case, then, that the glory of the cross comes from the honor of Christ? In what way is the cross exalted if he is despised in the image? Rather, he will be despised even more, even if you seem to glorify the cross. What do you think you can attain, displaying a scepter that is opposed to the king of the universe? Why do you exalt with divine honors what is inferior and reject what is superior? Foolish and blind, says the Lord, what is greater: the gold, or the temple that sanctifies the gold? And it is certainly no different in the case of those who appear to honor the symbol of the cross and indeed do not honor the image of Christ. Enough.

A Response to Ignatios's Poem

O Word, so as to strengthen among the mortals the worship of God,
And in order to grant a clearer understanding of yourself,
You established by law that the cross *alone would be represented.*

VI. You who endlessly talk in a foolish manner! Why, then, should the Word have given a law that the cross alone should be depicted, in order to establish devotion for the mortals, and to make it easier to understand his mystery? This is indeed not what we have heard today, but rather that "the grace of God has appeared, that grace which will save all men, so that, letting go of impiety, and of earthly desires, we should live in this century, soberly, and justly, and piously, waiting for the blessed hope, and the coming of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, to redeem us from all iniquity, and to choose for himself an acceptable people, a people that would accomplish good works."[40] The Word, then, gave himself, out of the express good will of the Father, with the cooperation of the Holy Spirit, not in order to judge the world but in order to save it, as he himself said. And he even gave his own body, as he himself said, "And the bread, which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

This is according to the first word, what is blessed (*to sebas*); this is the more manifest cognition, the law; this is the participation in the

divine mysteries, as long as we obey the divinely given command to do so in memory of him. If it is the cross, this is an excellent thing, but not on an equal level, but inferior.[41] And then the spear and the nails and whatever else has been used in the life-giving passion should be worshiped. And for whatever he suffered, there are corresponding instruments of the passion; the passion is holy and divine, and thus the instruments are sanctified and deified. This is really what matters. How, then, can you put aside the things that are written and speak instead those that are not written? How is it that when you speak, you leave aside what is more important and prefer what is of lesser import? How can you, asserting that this is to be found in scripture, claim that this has been transmitted by way of divine law? O stupor! O licentious madness! Such is falsehood: it has no light, and no probation of truth. Truly, what he says must be denied.

You established by law that the cross *alone would be represented.*
You also chose that out of an artificial material,
The cross may also be painted on the walls, and as it was in the past,
so it should be now.

VII. Do you see now how this blessed man[42] is talking in a manner that is removed from common sense (*asyllogistōs*), as if he were to speak to people lacking the ability to hear? For what reason, then, should what the Word allegedly disdained become instead worthy of honor and of being made more widely known in the case of the cross? As if he had not become a human being. But he did become flesh, which can be most certainly circumscribed, as all human flesh, and indeed [it can be circumscribed] with artificial material. Indeed, this is called an artificial (*technētē*) image, whether it is seen on the wall, or on a canvas, or in whatever other material; and the same with the image of the cross. And why, then, is the painting on the walls considered valid, when it is in aid of indecency? Perhaps because the painting is unworthy. In what way then would painting on the cross advance his honor and his popularity? Indeed, whatever is honorable and convenient should be of greater honor to Christ than what is to his detriment.

Any artist prefers to be held in good esteem because of what he has himself accomplished, and not because of the tools of his art. And whoever is eager to see prefers to see the artist engaged in the act of painting rather than the instrument that the artist uses to paint. If, indeed, something is bodiless, it cannot be painted; if it is embodied, the claim that it could not possibly be painted cannot be understood

by anyone who is endowed with the faculty of reason. Did you not hear God saying to the prophet, "Take up a book that should be new and great, and write in it with the writing of a human being"?[43] For what cause did God say that? Because the only Son of God became man, and he continues to write with the writing of a human being, even in us, so that we can understand that he, while being uncircumscribed with the Father and the Holy Spirit, chose to be seen for our sake, and he is now circumscribed [in the flesh], as the choir of the saints will confirm with one voice.

In whatever manner you interpret this passage of scripture, you will see that it truly foreshadows circumscription (*perigraphē*), or rather, iconic representation (*exeikonisis*).[44] What does the image of the cross show? Does it not show the life-giving tree? What else does it show but the fact that on the tree of the cross, the life-giving Word was killed in the flesh? Why, then, can what killed be painted, but what was killed cannot be painted? It is not possible to assert this with any coherence, as such belief is incompatible with the nature of things. If we were to follow this train of thought, we would have all sorts of consequences going counter to our reason: what cannot be painted would kill what can be painted; what is not embodied would kill what is embodied. This is absurd, however, because everything that is embodied can be painted; not even those who have invented the deer-goats have conceived such nonsense.[45] Indeed, when Christ was wounded by the spear, did he not let go blood and water from his side? Did he not let go of the spirit having inclined his head? Was he not buried, having been enveloped in a shroud with spices? Are these things not perceptible? And is it not the case that whatever is perceptible can be described (*eggraphesthai*)?[46] And so, he who has suffered these things, which are the same as the things that are also our condition to suffer, should not be circumscribed? And the one who deigned himself to suffer such things (and I include here all that happens in the nativity, and all the things that happened later, the mocking, the insults, the humiliations, the betrayal, the chains, the derisions, the whips, the hittings, the spittings) for the salvation of the world also deigned himself to be painted, so that the image may show to our eyes those things more clearly than speech may be able to declare. Hence, whence is the offense?

Now, imagine that Christ did not suffer of his own will. In this case, someone would consider it an insult if someone were to narrate and depict what he suffered. But Christ suffered of his own will,

hence, he might actually consider it an insult to himself if no one were to narrate or to paint what took place. There is no one, indeed, who does not love that the things that he bore out of charity for one's neighbor should be remembered in speech and in painting, since both speech and painting are going to bring him immortal glory.

VIII. Do you see, then, you who lack in intellect and wisdom, that you procure injury to God? Or do you think perhaps that Christ was displeased with what he had done,[e] or that he did not suffer of his own will? What did you drink, and from what revolting mud of impiety, so that you could vomit such a flood of horrors? Away with such stench! And again I ask: how is it that what can be seen cannot be painted? And in what way, if the Word became man, could he have a [human] nature, but this human nature could not be painted? Such a thing is indeed nothing less than an enigma. It would be the same as if someone were to say that there is a man who is in all things similar to everyone else in his own nature and in the way things are; and yet it is impossible to claim that he has a body, or that he is seen, or that he can be touched, or that he eats, or drinks, or sleeps, or walks, or speaks; nor is it possible to say that he was crucified, or died, or was buried; and yet, despite all this, this man is of such condition and nature that he can be painted in the form of men. What then? Is this not ridiculous and fanciful? And there would be the same laughter and ridicule, if not even more, if someone talking of the incarnate Word—whom everyone confesses in everything to be similar to us—were to affirm all the properties listed above but were simultaneously to assert that it is impossible that the Word should be painted. Hence, circumscription asserts affirmatively (*kataphatikôs*) all the things that are denied; so in Christ the negation of the painting eliminates negatively (*apophatikôs*) all the things that are claimed of him, and [everything] is therefore appearance and imagination, and Marcion again triumphs and so do Manes, and Valentinos, and Ignatios, who belong to the same school.[m]

A Response to Sergios's Poem

Moses openly defeated the powers of evil raising a type,
And with the aid of a type he crushed the enemy. In the same way now
the cross,
Glory of the faithful, stops the strong torrent of error.

IX. You seemed to me, O learned man, to have strayed from the right path and to have fallen into the abyss of perdition. Indeed, what does Moses seem to you if not the figure of Christ, when he defeated Amalec in the figure of the cross, which the extended hands displayed?[n] In what way, then, will you accept a typological interpretation in that case, but here instead you fraudulently separate the archetype from the type? You brought forth an example involving the cross, but you rejected the one who was crucified. It was not the cross that destroyed the error, but the Christ who was crucified on it; as it is written, "Having defeated the principalities and powers, he exposed them to public contempt, having triumphed over them in himself."[o]

Should I perhaps go mad and repeat what you said? Which cross do you talk about, if you please, and which error? I understand clearly that you are talking of the symbol of the cross and of the image of Christ; you are calling the symbol "cross" with the name of the prototype, as it is customarily called; you do the same with every image; but in the case of Christ, since even his image is called "Christ," you acted with the violence of a flood and you called Christ "a mistake" that must be taken from the cross![p] O worse than Jewish madness! If these enemies of Christ were said to have a devil and were called Samaritans, they would appear to be less conceited. The sword is taken away from the fighter; Christ is indeed divided upon himself,[q] having been separated from his own weapon. Who will be able to cope with such blasphemy? And really, look, the consequences of this deceit are of such magnitude that the Christian people will leave behind the adoration of the Trinity and will apostatize to Greek polytheism, denying the fact that Christ became man.

Tell us, O men, who were those who were found guilty [of venerating the images], and those instead who stood up against you? Let us know, so that, knowing what constitutes guilt for you, we may be able to resist your teaching if the occasion arises. Let us imagine that someone has never seen Christ depicted in an image. This person could still be induced to believe in Christ in unity with the Father and the Holy Spirit, if he came to know the secrets of theology (*tês theologias*), as well as the mystery of the divine economy (*tês oikonomias*). Let us imagine, instead, that the only way to come to know of the incarnation is to see Christ depicted in an image. Now, this at least would confirm that Christ became man.[r]

You should understand, then, that you are really like a violent flow of errors that is never restrained and that constantly comes out again from the sea of the old lack of faith. Because of this lack of faith, there is no certainty as to the incarnation of Christ, and people suffer because of their impiety. Is it not clear then? For you, the sacred temples are places of idolatry; the divine anathemas are profanities; the servants of God have been deceived. Truly, what you said was impious and demonstrated your lack of faith in God; your words were the cause of disaster and spiritual death for many. And let us now turn to what follows.

In a similar way, then, the creation of art, not unlike a hidden arrow
Thrown with an evil intent, penetrates deeply into the souls.
This is how their wound is felt by those who are subject to Christ.

X. What are you saying, O silly man—are you suggesting that the image of Christ, which has saved the cosmos, has actually resulted in the loss of souls? What defeated error is an arrow drawn by an evil intent? Anyone who was bitten by one of these noetic serpents, and who has started to look at it with faith, will immediately run away when he discerns the real poison of evil that carries death.[34] When the Word was not yet incarnate, he worked for our salvation, and he was not a force of destruction. And now that he became incarnate for us in an unchangeable form, you would suggest that his representation is not salvific, but it is actually harmful? "Hark, O heaven, and listen, O earth, because the Lord has spoken. I nourished and exalted the sons, but they despised me. The ox recognized his owner, and the donkey the manger of his Lord," but Sergios "did not recognize me," [35] as scripture says; Ah, if he had run toward me, but instead he caused me much insult. O you, man who truly is lost and impious and an enemy of Christ, you dare to be against Christ? You stand up against the image of Christ—an image that even the angels honor and the demons abhor? And whose name would you rather have? That of Saturn, or Jupiter, or Mars, or Venus, or Diana, or of any of the other false gods, whose naming is deception, and whose accusation is deceit? Without Jesus Christ, no one, then, "can say the Lord Jesus Christ, unless he is in the Holy Spirit,"[36] as scripture says; see what you blasphemed not only in Jesus Christ but also in the Holy Spirit according to the Jewish custom, because you have called the name of Jesus Christ, which is said or painted in the Holy Spirit, dangerous to the life of the souls.[37] O tongue that has talked impiously! O mouth that has spoken iniquity against God the most high! "What is an idol," asks

the Apostle, "or anything that is sacrificed to the idols? Whatever is sacrificed by the Gentiles is sacrificed to the demons, and not to God."[38]

For us, instead, there is only one God, who is called holy and who is worshiped in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. We know also that the Son of man truly became God, and he was called similar to us in everything. And as every human being can be represented by an image, the same goes for Christ; for the sake of our salvation, we can contemplate these painted images, these sacred lights, these memorials of salvation, where we see Christ born, baptized, performing miracles, crucified, buried, risen again, ascended into heaven. In all these mysteries of his life, we readily admit that things did not come to pass as they are represented in the images; we assent to this claim with our senses and with our soul,[39] yet, [in the contemplation of the images] both our senses and our soul are confirmed in their faith in the mystery of the incarnation, which brings about piety and every spiritual fruit.

You, having summed everything up, opposing the figure of the cross, incurred into the highest error. I ask, indeed, for what reason you should want to paint the cross when the one who was crucified should not be painted. You say to everyone: [Christ cannot be represented], because he does not have a nature that can be represented. But if he does not have a nature that can be represented, much less does he have a nature that can suffer; anyone who is endowed with the faculty of reason will agree. Why is this the case? Even an angel, who has no body and therefore cannot suffer, can be depicted the way we are depicted; Moses himself, in obedience to the divine command, represented an angel, and the angel did not have any physical characteristics, nor could he suffer.[40] If we follow what you say, the mystery of the incarnation is a product of the imagination, or a ruse. But it is you, impostor, you, who extracted the evil arrow from the sheath of impiety, who should call yourself an error that is lethal and dangerous to the souls.

This is how their wound is felt by those who are subject to Christ.

XI. So, can the one whose mind is blinded really understand what we have been talking about? Whatever has been said until now—all the aspersions that were cast against the icon of Christ—Sergios sent out to Christ himself. This is the truth, even if he is not aware of it. He said nothing positive about Christ; he launched a harmful invective against his image; and finally he says, "This is how those who

are wise understand Christ."[58] What else can be said about such absurdities, apart from what we have been saying until now?

A Response to Stephanos's Poem

As support of the faithful, and as something that is worthy of divine veneration,
You gave us, O Word, the salvific cross, the life-giving type of the passion.

XII. That the Word gave us the cross for our salvation, as a support for the faithful and a divine blessing, is clear to everyone, but the cross is certainly not the life-giving type (*typos*) of the suffering of Christ, O you who talk foolishly. How is it possible that in the image of the cross, Christ should be represented as he is captured, he is bound by chains, he is beaten by sticks, he is spat at, crucified, wounded by the lance, or anything else you may wish to add? This is absolutely, utterly impossible. The cross indeed signifies (*sēmainei*) Christ, [it] does not represent (*typoi*) him. For this reason the cross is also called "sign" (*sēmeion*) by the divine scripture.[62] "Moses, then," it says, "put the serpent as a sign,"[63] which refers to the cross.

One thing, indeed, is the sign, and the other is the representation; in the same way, the morning star signifies the day; the sun itself, on the contrary, represents or shows the day. In the same way, Christ is signified by the cross, but he is represented in his own image. The archetype appears in the image; thus speaks the blessed Dionysius,[64] and with him also the other fathers, for whom the terms *image* and *type* are synonymous. This, indeed, is the life-giving type of the passions: the image of Christ! You, who chose to hide the image, have now been shamed in front of everyone.[65] The type of the cross signifies all the mysteries of our salvation. And if the cross, which is only a sign, is the anchor and the blessing of the faithful, how much more beneficial will actual images be? Such, indeed, is the truth, and not as you had claimed with your false speech.

Indeed, you chose to suppress as an error
The earlier divine prohibition against representation,
And this is the law that everyone is mandated to follow

XIII. What is not allowed is evil, and not what is allowed; what is against nature, and not what is in accordance with nature. If then,

before the incarnation, someone had made an image of the Word, that would not have been just wrong, but it would also have been an absurd lie, as it would have made the non-incarnate Word resemble the fleshly and he who was not similar to anyone would have been put on display in an effigy that resembles all other members of humanity. This is why God himself said, "To which likeness will you compare me?"[66] This was idolatry, and indeed, it had been banned by God himself.

You who fight God, listen! You who say this after the incarnation are false and deceitful; even if you support the cross, you set out to take away the image that has been given for the salvation of the cosmos. Talking against the image, you tried to show that things that are compatible with each other are actually in opposition to each other, since in the image of Christ, it is also possible to see the cross being expressed. But no, he did not truly exist, no one ever called him a divine man, and he was not seen in our likeness! Nor did he have a body that was sensible to touch and color, from which derive quantity and quality, as well as position in place and extension in time. Anyone who can use reason, even just moderately, will understand that these are properties of circumscription! In what way, then, is it possible to say that he who has such properties is not circumscribed? In what way is it that he who has assumed the likeness of men should not be painted in the likeness of men? In what way can he be found in a form (*schēma*) as a man, if he does not have a form?

What is this ignorance (*anoia*) and this disagreement (*machē*) in such important matters? It is as if someone were to say that as the sun rises, the night is coming! Is it not the case that a line is made up of points? And that lines can form triangular figures as well as others of a different shape? And is it not the case that out of the different geometrical figures one can create a face, and if we paint a face in an image, this will be recognized as that of a human being, as is taught by the scriptures, which are divinely inspired? Or is Christ perhaps without form? The Apostle claims that he took the shape (*morphē*) of a servant;[67] perhaps you would suggest that he lacked shape? Or that as he was found in the form of a man, he nonetheless lacked form? Or that he assumed the likeness of men, and yet he was dissimilar? Indeed, the representation is a similitude (*homoiōma*). "O you, full of every fallacy and every deceit, son of the devil, enemy of every justice, you will never cease to subvert the straight ways of the Lord!"[68] These words are not from me; Paul sings such things to you, the new Ebionas

Moreover, deceitful man, think of this: the characteristics (*idiōmata*) of the same nature are of equal power (*isodynama*) and are complementary (*allēlouchia*); as such, if one is present, of necessity even the remaining ones will be there; similarly, if one is taken away, even the other ones will be taken away. To list the properties of the divine nature, for instance, [one can mention] the lack of a body, invisibility, incomprehensibility, uncircumscribability, immutability, impassibility, and all sorts of other ones. If, then, by hypothesis, one of these properties happened to be taken away or to change—such as, for instance, incomprehensibility—and then we were to say that the divinity is circumscribable; if then we were to list all the properties of divinity, as soon as one is eliminated, all the remaining properties are simultaneously eliminated; and it would follow that the divinity could be comprehended, and had a body, and could be seen, and circumscribed, and was liable to mutation, and passible; since it is impossible, as said already, that with the elimination or subtraction of a property all the other ones should not also be eliminated or subtracted.

The same can be said for the humanity of Christ. The properties of humanity are corporeality, visibility, circumscribability, variability, possibility, and all other characteristics that, along with these, inhere in every human being. If, then, you chose to eliminate or subtract one of the properties mentioned above—such as, for instance, circumscribability—Christ, even according to his humanity, would become uncircumscribable, and incorporeal, and invisible, and incomprehensible, and immutable, and impassible. Your words, therefore, should be advertised as they are, without omitting any of them, even if they are full of impiety, and they are only worthy of the arenas.[48]

And this is the law that everyone is mandated to follow:
Always worship that cross, to which you were hung, and through which you redeemed us.

XIV. Yet again this charlatan appears to be speaking unreasonably. It is as if we were to say that the king has saved the city by thrusting the spear into someone, and then the foolish one says that we should forget the king and worship the spear alone. It is thus necessary to say: first, we should worship you, O Christ, and then the cross from which you saved us; first, we shall worship the one who saved us, and after that we shall worship that through which the salvation has come. Oh, what a horrid display of impiety, and what a bitter announcement! Stephanos is truly fighting against Christ.

Further, in Response to Stephanos's Second Poem

As the emperor would not allow that Christ should be painted
Through an image without speech, and devoid of spirit,
Using earthly matter which the scriptures condemn
Leo with his son, the new Constantine,
Impressed the happy type of the cross
Glory of the faithful, on the doors of the palace.

XV. "The silly man," says scripture, "will say silly things, and his heart will meditate over error."[49] Is it even proper to ask again for which cause, O you who devise falsity, for what reason the emperor does not wish that Christ should be painted "through an image without speech and devoid of spirit"? It is certainly not proper. What about an image that emits a voice and draws breath? After all, the images of Christ lack these properties. It is only appropriate that all images that are the product of human ability (*technēi*) should be without voice and without breath; otherwise such an image would not be a reproduction, but a prototype, or a natural image, in the same way as everyone has his own father. Why should it be, then, that whatever can be seen in the image of an ordinary human person should not be seen in the image of Christ as well—in the image of the one who is similar in all things to all men, "and in the same way participated with us in flesh and blood,"[50] as scripture says? Perhaps you chose to withhold faith from what is revealed in scripture, and you decided on your own advice (*boulēi*) to contemplate a Christ who has no blood and no flesh, in the Manichean manner.[51] However, if you believe what is officially professed by everyone, you will have to accept that Christ can be painted like all other human beings, to whom "he is similar in all things except for sin";[52] if this were not the case, the absence of representation (*hē agraphia*) could be construed as a negation of the incarnation.

It is also important to remember that the image of Christ does not represent the imprint of the invisible soul, or—indeed, even less so—an imprint of the divinity. Rather, the image of Christ is an imprint of his body, as would be the case with every human being. On the cross, however, his holy body lacked its voice and its breath; for this reason it was called a "dead image" (*nekrōn eikōn*) by St. Gregory the Armenian.[53] As such, it is only right that Christ, in a likeness from the Armenian,[53] As such, it is only right that Christ, in a likeness from a likeness, should be represented as a form that lacks voice and is

devoid of breath. You did nothing but expose yourself to ignominy by talking nonsense. Let us have a look again at your fanciful hypothesis (*to theōrēma*).

As the emperor would not allow that Christ should be painted
Through an image without speech, and devoid of spirit,
Using earthly matter which the scriptures condemn.[75]

XVI. I would really like to know from Stephanos in what way, if not "using earthly matter which scripture condemns," the type of the cross could be impressed? In what way does the Lord suffer dishonor from it? But here, the cross is represented instead of Christ; it opposes him, and as it fails to carry Christ, it carries ignominy. Do you see, O wise man, how foolish (*paidia*) such things are in the eyes of Christ? After all, the flesh that carried God is from the same human stock as Adam, and the flesh of human beings is earthly matter. Or perhaps in you there is nothing earthly?

Most foolish man, not all matter is despised by the holy scriptures, but only that which is the explicit target of this censure. Many things that could be included in the list (*graphidōs*) of what God gave to humanity belong to the realm of matter, and they are not condemned by anyone. Instead, all you want to do is to call the image of Christ an idol, acting in an arbitrary manner (*apodeiktikōs*) and thinking that you are obeying those apostolic words, "Remember, then, that when you were pagans, you used to go to the idols that have no voice, according to your inclinations";[76] and thus, you wanted to show that the Christians fall into perdition in the manner of the Gentiles according to the sentence of the Apostle, even now, when there are no more idols in the world, and the blessed name of the Lord is invoked throughout the whole earth; now that we all confess one faith, one Lord, one baptism; now that one pure sacrifice is offered in opposition to the sacrifices to the idols, and that from the rising of the sun to its setting the image of Christ is displayed in all sacred temples; after so many holy councils, which held the image of Christ in front of their eyes;[77] after Christ is now present in the public places (lit. *en prothyrois*, "on the lodges").[78]

You see here an error that is worse than all the heresies that have emerged after the coming of Christ. Indeed, among those, none tried to negate Christ openly (*prophanōs*), but this one heresy tries to do exactly that. He who rejects the type of the cross, does he not deny the cross as well? So, then, he who despises the image of Christ, he also

despises Christ in the most extreme manner. If you are ready to admit that the first statement is true, how can you reject the second? Why, then, do you mix things that should not be mixed, and acting in a demonic manner (*daimoniōdōs*), you apply to the icon of Christ whatever is said of the idols? Is it not the case that whatever the law says is said to those under the law? Is it not the case that all those things that the Apostle says are said to those who at his time lived like the pagans? Do you not hear St. Athanasios shouting, "We who are faithful do not venerate the images like gods—perish the thought!—in the manner of the Gentiles, but we show not only the manner, but also the depth of our love (*agapē*) toward the imprint of the countenance (*prosōpon*) of the image"?[79]

Thus, over and over again, having destroyed the imprint, we should throw the image to the fire, as wood that from now on is useless. The Gentiles, however, thought that the wood itself in its own nature, and the gold and the silver, sculpted with human figures, were their own gods. These are the idols that the prophet and the Apostle condemn: idols that do not see, even if they have eyes; idols that have no voice or speech, even if they have a mouth; and idols whose members do not work, if they are represented with any of their members. Stop, then, blaspheming against Christ in a Jewish manner (*Ioudaikōs*).

DECLARATION[80]

XVII. Following the doctrine of the apostles and the fathers, and believing in the power of the church to lay down the law (*thesmothesia*), accepting the six holy and ecumenical councils, as well as that council that was celebrated at the Blachernae and that which met to confirm the latter;[81] following and accepting the orthodox teachings equally affirmed by all the councils, rejecting what they rejected, and receiving what they received; spurning the fabrication and the veneration of images, rejecting the meeting held under Tarasios,[82] and anathematizing those who disagree, I signed this by my own hand (*idiocheirōs*).

XVIII. Every heresy that has emerged in recent times believes that it is rejecting earlier heresies; that it accepts the doctrines of the apostles and the fathers; that it receives the holy councils that were held before its time; and whenever the heresy is assessed against the

word of truth, its supporters claim that there is no disagreement between their claims. The same can be said of the heresy that we are considering today, and, with the help of God, we are going to show this in the course of this oration.

First of all, we must ask the following: In what way, O intelligent man, despising all making and worship of images, you claim that you are following the teaching of the apostles and the fathers? The Apostle says the following: "The law indeed possesses the shadow of the future goods, but it does not possess the actual image (*eikona*) of the realities."[79] According to the Apostle, the shadow represents what is old, the image represents what is new, and the realities are nothing but the future goods. Gregory the Theologian, in line with Paul, says that grace and law are examples of one another;[80] and indeed, these words are sometimes used interchangeably. The image is sometimes called type, and the shadow is also called type. "Look," says scripture, "you shall make all things according to the example (*kata ton typon*) that was shown to you on the mountain."[81] In the same way, the same Paul calls those things that belong to the law "antitypes (*antitypa*) of things that exist in reality";[82] therefore, shadow, type, and antitype are the same thing.

Dionysius, the wisest of men, says somewhere, "All the things that were carried out in the sacred rituals in accordance with the law, these things he called the image of the type that was shown to him on Mount Sinai."[83] In the words of David, "We move in this life as if in an image (*en eikoni*)."[84] And again, in the words of Dionysius, "To the extent that it is possible, we rise to divine contemplation by means of sensible images."[85] He calls image the holy altar; and the sacred unguent; and the type of the cross; and he even calls images those who live in such a way as to signify, by way of a similar form (*homoeideis*), the cruciform image of their own sinlessness. All the implements that are seen in the liturgical ceremonies are also called images.

What will you say now? If you consider all these things, are they not tantamount to the making and the veneration of images? Of course they are; and as you despise these things, you clearly hold in contempt not just the teaching of the apostles and the fathers, but also the New Testament; and if you despise the New Testament, you also despise the Old. Indeed, I see that you even despise yourself and the angels. The human being, after all, is an image of God, to the extent that it is possible to imitate what cannot be imitated; to this point, scripture says, "I made man in the image of God."[86] And an angel is also

an image of God, says the blessed Denys.[87] You will, then, have to accept, even if you are reluctant, that images can be made and can be venerated, since both angels and men can be the object of veneration. Thus, you made earthly things, as well as celestial things, the object of your contempt. You did not even distinguish between one kind of image and the other—I mean, between the natural image and the one that is painted—but you chose to despise all making and veneration of images, leaving nothing untouched by your contempt apart from the Holy Trinity, as the Trinity alone cannot be associated with the making of an image, because the Trinity is not created, but uncreated.

It is not possible to interpret your claims any differently. But let us now return to the subject matter.

Following the doctrine of the apostles and the fathers, despising all making and veneration of images.

The Voice of Peter, Prince of the Apostles:

XIX. Take the image of our Lord Jesus Christ, and take it to the tower, so that the peoples may see what form the Son of God chose to assume.[92]

The Voice of St. Denys:

XX. The super-essential cause (*teletarchia*), out of love of humanity, described the super-celestial intellects (*noas*) by way of visible images, and inscribed these images in the passages of scripture that describe holy matters.[93]

The Voice of St. Athanasios:

XXI. We who are faithful do not venerate the images as divine—perish the thought—as the Greeks do, but we display the nature (*schesis*) and the intensity (*pathos*) of our love toward the imprint of the form of the image.[94]

The Voice of St. Basil:

XXII. Come to me, O you famous painters of athletic triumphs, and with your art give glory to the mutilated image of the leader. *And after other things:* May also Christ, who was victorious in battle (*agōnothetēs*), be painted on a table.[95]

The Voice of St. Gregory of Nazianzos:

XXIII. Observing the famous Polemon in an image:

Seeing it—and it was awesome indeed—
She left at once, defeated by the sight,
Put to shame by the one depicted, as if he were alive.[96]

The Voice of St. John Chrysostom:

XXIV. And I conceived love for an image molten out of wax, which was overflowing with devotion; in the image an angel was seen, striking the crowds of the infidels. I saw the tribes of the infidels being punished, and David saying with the voice of truth (*alētheuonta*): "Lord, in your city you will reduce their image to nothing."[97]

The Voice of St. Gregory of Nyssa:

XXV. I often saw an image of this pitiable event in painting; and this vision was not unaccompanied by tears; with such mastery (*enargōs*) the art was bringing the story to the sight. Isaac lies down...[98]

Voice of St. Cyril:

XXVI. In a wall painting, I saw a girl who was fighting in the arena; and I did not see this image without shedding tears.[99]

The Voice of the Fathers of the Sixth Holy Council:

XXVII. In a number of paintings of the venerable images, we can see the lamb indicated with a finger by the Forerunner.[100] Among other things, the council fathers also say: So that even what is perfect (*to teleion*) could be represented to the eyes of all using the power of colors, we order that the image of the one who takes away the sin of the world—the Lamb, the anointed of our God—from now on should be represented in the icons according to his human form.

XXVIII. I just selected a few statements out of the many that are available, so as not to cause boredom (*koros*). Here is again the doctrine of the apostles and of our fathers, the sublimity (*hē akrotēs*) of the apostles, the foundation of the tradition, the keys of the dogma, the norm of the correct faith; if anyone were to contradict any of these statement, even if he is an angel,[101] he is condemned and declared to be anathema; he does not come from the apostles or from the fathers, but he is deceitful and carries a false name. In spurning all fabrication and veneration of images, you rejected the norm of the correct faith, even if you did not say that you rejected it, as Moab of old.[102]

And obeying the dispositions of the church.

XXIX. The law, then, is holy; and so are the ancient customs, which the great Basil told us to keep.[103] Our customs are based on the traditions of the church, and these are the customs of the church in all its temples and holy places that are on this earth. Indeed, from its very foundation, and from the beginning of the preaching of God's good news (*tou theiou kerygmatos*), the church venerated the sacred

images that you now despise.[104] This is the tradition of church that you tried with all your might to abrogate.

Receiving [the teaching of] the six holy and ecumenical councils.

XXX. If we consider the orthodox councils, both those that are ecumenical and those that are local—no matter how many they were in number, they were, so to speak, all the same—if one considers what truly gave them power and strength, we will see that they were all one in terms of their understanding of the divine wisdom, in the same way as the symbol of faith is one. The councils were convened against the heresies of the time as the need arose (*kata kairon*), and having opposed the heretic viewpoints in all sorts of ways, they remained firmly in the same orthodox dogma. To use an example, the same happens for the grain of wheat, which is one when it is sown but potentially also possesses different types of grains, in virtue of its power to carry fruit at the opportune time.

Let us see, then, in what way, if you accept the first council, you will at the same time accept all the others. Leaving aside the synods that took place at an earlier time, as they are not relevant to the current question, we remember how [the Council of Nicaea] affirmed:

> [I believe] in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God the only begotten, born from the Father before all ages; light from light, true God from true God, born, not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things were made. And for us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven, and was incarnate from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and was made man.[105]

All the saints confess, then, that [the Son] was born of the Father before all ages, and that he was incarnate and was made man from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and that he was one from the point of view of the hypostasis and double, so to speak, from the point of view of the nature, perfect in divinity and perfect in humanity.

Christ is uncircumscribed according to that which he received from the Father, in the same way as the Father is uncircumscribed; he is circumscribed according to that which he received from the mother, as even the mother is circumscribed. As is the Father, the same in all things is also the one who is generated by him (*ho gennētheis*); and as is the mother, the same in all things is also whatever is

born (*to gennēthes*) from her;[106] so that, if only one of these properties were to cease, the whole complex system would be eliminated, and everything would perish. The mother is depicted in her nature according to the form of her body, because she is circumscribed; the same applies, then, to Christ, because Christ is a circumscribed issue of the mother. If this were not the case, Christ would not have been generated by the mother in nature and in truth. He is a true son of the mother, in the same way as he is a true Son of the Father. Thus, while he can be represented after the imprint of the body, as far as the divinity is concerned he is uncircumscribable like the Father; as a result, because of the necessary structure of each nature, each has to take testimony from the other.[107] Thus the first holy ecumenical council, as the highest authority in the church, claimed that Christ could be represented, since it confessed that he had taken flesh and had become man. No one, indeed, who has a body is uncircumscribable; no one who can be seen is unable to be represented in an icon.

In the same way [the council of Ephesus] did not call Mary "the Mother of God" in virtue of her own power (*kyriolektōs*), but as the council affirmed that through her the Son of God had taken flesh and had become man, the council declared her to be Mother of God in virtue of the power of Christ. If, then, the one who is generated is God, it follows that the one who generates is the Mother of God; this is how the third council could announce this clearly and explicitly and could refute Nestorios.[108] [The council of Ephesus] did not declare explicitly that in Christ there were two natures and the corresponding two wills, but once it had been recognized that Christ was God as well as a human being, and once his two generations (*gennēseis*) had been openly proclaimed, it did not take long to conclude that there were two natures, and therefore, if there were two natures, there were also two wills. It was left to the fourth and the sixth councils to announce this explicitly and properly, and thus these councils refuted those who preached that in Christ there was only one nature and one will.[109]

It would take long to explain in detail how every heresy came about, somehow anticipating the orthodox dogma that would then be proclaimed by a council at the appropriate time. But once we have established and proved this fact, how is it possible for you to say that you reject the making and the veneration of images, but you do not reject the teaching of the first council? We saw how that council announced implicitly that one could make images of Christ's human

form. Similarly, [if you reject the veneration of images], you also fail to receive the remaining councils, because the teaching of all councils is the same.

Receiving also the council that was held at the Blachernae, and that which met to confirm the latter.

XXXI. Clearly, you listen to and agree with those who oppose the truth, and disagree with the teaching of the apostles and the fathers, as we said earlier. After all, [the council fathers at Blachernae] banned the fabrication and veneration of images.

And rejecting what those councils rejected, and receiving what they received.

XXXII. Indeed; but you do so in the manner of the assembly of Caiphas, which accepted Barabbas and denied Christ.[110]

Spurning, however, the assembly that was celebrated under Tarasios.

XXXIII. Listen carefully: if you oppose the first holy council when it announces that Christ can be represented according to his human form, [you will also reject] his image, and the image of the life-giving cross, and that of the Mother of God; you will also deny that there should be any veneration of the images of the saints in honor of their prototypes—those saints, from whom you are now separated, in the same way as Judas was separated from Christ.

And casting anathemas against those who disagree.

XXXIV. Of course, but the truth of the matter is that you are an enemy of all the saints, in the same way as you are an opponent of Christ.

I signed this by my own hand.

Surely, but, like Pilate, you signed with a reed, to condemn Christ.[111]

Declaration of the Orthodox[112]

XXXV. I obey all evangelical and apostolic commands and all the edicts of the church; I am strengthened in the faith by the voice of the prophets and by the decisions of the holy fathers. I receive the teaching of the six holy ecumenical councils and of the other local synods that are in agreement with the former (*homodoxois*), as far as dogmatic and canonical observance are concerned, and together with these, I also accept the Quinisext Council,[113] which addressed the

question of the blessed images and issued decrees out of divine fear; I accept the second holy council held in Nicaea,[114] which offered dogmatic opinions in an orthodox manner in accordance to what had been declared before, and also in agreement to the Quinisext Council that had preceded it and that had also discussed the holy icons; and I reject all that had been rejected by all the councils. I accept everything that has been approved by these councils; I submit myself to every sacred deliberation, and I accept every custom that has come down to use from Christ or that we are certain that it was instituted in a holy manner after that; I worship with great devotion every image that ever existed or that was ever produced in the world for the sake of our salvation, whether of Christ our God, of the life-giving cross, of the Mother of God, of the angels, and of every male and female saint. And I firmly reject the assembly held at the Blachernae and the meeting that it confirmed,[115] as both of them are enemies of Christ and of all the saints, and I cast eternal anathemas against all those who disagree; with the help of God, I undersigned with my own hand.

More Iambic Poems by the Iconoclasts[116]

JOHN

Acrostic: The Passion of Christ Is a Hope for John.[117]

With the divine strength of the cross, Christ destroyed
The onslaught of the phalanx of the demons; for those who
are in this mortal life,
Christ has become a refuge and **hope** against all challenges:
His disciples taught so openly, and confided only in him.
Thus, it is not allowed to depict the Lord on the walls.
God indeed is whole, hardly changed by error,
And he gives glory to those who rule the kingdom with justice.

IGNATIOS

Acrostic: To Ignatios, the Cross Is Glory.[118]

The cross, which brought together those things which before
were dispersed,
Confirms piety with sincerity.
The cross triumphs over all contemplation of images,
And extolled your glory, O Lord.
Having come to know the value of the true faith.
The emperors worship the cross in an appropriate manner
And expel the enemies that serve the power (*tô kratei*).[119]

I Expel the Enemies, and I Slaughter the Barbarians[120]

Leo and Constantine, the blessed emperors,
Who received their power from God alone,
Remove (*anistorousi*) the type of the Lord;
This is what their hearts led them to do.
And having seen the vain creations of the past,
From then onward they banned the fabrication of images.[121]

APPENDIX

Celebratory Canon

...that is sung for the erection of the sacred images; clearly a work of the holy father Theodore the Studite[1]

Ode 1

Tone 6, according to the hymn: Helper and protector, etc.

Let us sing, O faithful, a song as an action of grace to the God and benefactor of all, because he raised a horn of salvation, and a great power, to protect the true faith.

Truly the divine grace has been shown to the world, and glory and honor are manifest; and for this reason the Church rejoices, having put on the stole of which she had earlier been stripped.[2]

The holy fathers, having woven again the garment of Christ, which had earlier been torn apart by John, the seducer and the maker of poisons, gave it back to the church.[3]

Having taken back the incarnate form of the Lord,[4] the Church exults and rejoices with her children; it has received from him the ensigns of victory, the symbols of orthodoxy.

May the equally insane Lezios and Anthony[5] be accursed in the future, and be considered foolish, together with John and Theodore, both deserters of the faith.

Jannes and Mambres once opposed Moses the legislator,[6] and by him they were confused. In the same way now the evil John and Anthony were unmasked.

You dispersed, O Christ, the host of the enemies of God, and you returned her honor to your church, for which you gave your blood in your goodness.[7]

θ (Tone 2) You, O Trinity, I affirm as God, and I prostrate myself in front of you, and I acknowledge your divine strength; deliver me from all temptations; in you, indeed, I believe, Father, and Son, and most Holy Ghost.[8]

θ' (Tone 3) Taking the royal stole from you, Virgin,[9] God appeared to humanity in the form of men, according to a dual essence, and we hold in veneration the image of his form.

Ode 3

Rejoice, all the throngs of the fathers and the apostles, considering the veneration of the images, which you yourselves have bravely transmitted to us.

I took over my beauty, and I put on my stole—so should the church boast, which John had despoiled.

Be accursed, O you who howl against the Lord; he indeed took up flesh, and appeared in an image, which we welcome and always associate with Christ (*schetikōs*).[10]

Who will recount the impious dogmas and the insane doctrines of the mindless John? Who will expose his tropes, and his sibylline strategies?

Let us issue an anathema against Letius and John, with Anthony, the atheist and blasphemous Theodore, together with the insane Theodotos.[11]

The blood cries, the blood which was spilled by John, and which was spilled because of the flesh-carrying divine likeness of the Lord.

The Lord destroyed the throngs of the enemies (lit. "of the foreign hordes"), and returned to his people what belonged to them; glory then to his goodness. Glory be…

Let us worship, according to the orthodox faith, the eternal will and power and kingdom of the Trinity, always covering Arios with infamy.[12]

Let us honor you, O Lady, in a proper manner, as the one who gave birth to God, relying on the dogmas of the holy fathers, and leaving aside the vain teachings of Nestorios.

Ode 4

Rejoice, Church, and every city and region should throw open its temples in exultation; the dwellings of the virgins and the sacred relics should be venerated; let them decorate with worthy honors the images of the martyrs.

Christ is calling us; come here eagerly, O divine fathers, and celebrate in a divine manner the miracle of his own incarnation, as well as his passion, as the holy Gospel describes.

Come together rejoicing, O you throng of the monks that speak the truth (*en parrhēsia*); if indeed again the enemies of the faith—O wretched ones!—were to prevail, again they would be defeated, and the Lord would disperse the heresy which these men uphold.

The enemies of the fathers, as well as the scars of their wounds have faded away; the frequent exiles have stopped, and peace is given to all; the industry of magic art shall no longer prevail, [for] God indeed is with us.

The vineyard of iniquity extends the trellises of impiety and produces bitter grapes, and the wrath of the dragons is their wine, by which they inebriated the people of God, because of their evil and darkened mind.

The impious ones defiled your temple, through their profane impositions of the hands[13] and their simoniac acts, and for this reason, according to the sacred canons, John and Anthony are cut off from the divine glory, and together with them also Simon Magos.[14]

Let us curse with an anathema those beasts, and the enemies of God, and the profane Anthony and the transgressor John, whose mind is enslaved to Satan, and those that disturb the Church, gathering together the faithful as wolves. Glory be to the Father…

O uncreated monarchy, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we worship you, whom the Cherubim, adorned with many eyes,

and the Seraphim, with six wings, praise shouting: Holy, holy, holy you are, O most high and omnipotent.
Holier than the saints, and higher than all creatures, you alone appeared at the same time as Mother and Virgin, O Bearer of God, as you gave birth to your own Creator, and for that reason we venerate your image.

Ode 5

Christ has won; let the earth rejoice; the tumult quieted down, and so did the tears of the servants of God; the faith then has been promulgated throughout the whole earth.
Looking at the image, let us venerate the crucifixion, honoring Christ and his ensigns, and prostrating ourselves in front of them; yet we shall not honor the images like gods;
The loquacious and blasphemous spirit of Lezios is now silent, which in the past used constantly, day after day, to talk against the form of Christ and his saints.
For what reason, O three times unhappy, did you prosecute the immaculate manifestation of the incarnate Christ, and of all the saints? Perhaps we faithful venerate deaf idols?
Having brought together the symbols of turpitude, they convened a synod of impious priests, against God the most high; as in the past the Jews, Annas and Caiphas.[15]
On the Day of Judgment, O most unhappy among men, the adversaries of your impious soul will rise, and so will the choir of the fathers, whose despoiled bodies you afflicted with innumerable plagues.
All the churches will shout, none of them ceasing, having been despoiled by you of the sacred images of the form of the Lord, and of his saints.
θ Glory to you, glory to you, three-hypostatic unity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, who contain everything with your power, and who deigned yourself to free those who resort to you.
θ' Similar to a lamp adorned with gold, we worship you, O Lady, who has given birth to the noetic light for the world, and who dissolved the dark cloud.

Ode 6

The vigilant (lit. *agrypnoi*, "sleepless") wardens of the church of Christ shouted asking him to be given peace, and he listened to them and fulfilled their request.
The ruses of the seducer have been uncovered, thanks to the teachings of the Fathers; and so God who has taken the form of the flesh is praised by hymns, he who has remained uncircumscribable.
You who took part in the seduction, shame be on you; and together with Anthony, may it be that Theodotus and Lezios be ruined, and so be Theodore, the nadir of perdition.
O unhappy man, you opened your mouth, not in spiritual canticles, but in blasphemies against the Lord, despising the blessed work of iconography.
You perverted the dogmas of the Father and the teachings of the apostles, writing against them, according to your impious belief, O John, enemy of Christ.
Your smoke filled with tears the eyes of the pious, but this smoke has been dissolved by the wind of the divine teachings, O insane John.
You tore apart the sacred stole, in the same way as Arius of old ripped the garment of Christ; for this reason you have been placed outside the church, having been expelled like a dog.
θ I honor a principle of divinity, in three hypostases, which is indeed one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, distinct through the characters (*charaktêrsi*) and the persons (*prosôpois*).[16]
θ' O virgin prophetically glorified by God, truly you were announced by the prophets as a city of God, from which was born your true Creator, who preserved you after the birth as you were before.[17]

Ode 7

The furnace of heresy that had been predominant for four weeks of years[18] has now been extinguished by divine grace.

which has burnt heretics (lit. "the Chaldeans"), and has refreshed the pious worshippers of the Trinity.

The church is decorated and beautified, and the faithful walk around it (*peribeblētai*), having received the sacred image of the Lord, and of his passion, and of the other mysteries, according to the divine laws.[19]

O Christian people belonging to the Lord, rejoice and celebrate, when you see the church again illumined by the beauty of the divine form, which, being God, he carried, so as to save us as a man.

The Word in the flesh experienced poverty and hunger and thirst; these are the properties of the divine essence, through which the latter is circumscribed. At the same time the Word is simple and uncircumscribed according to the divinity.

The miracles and the prophecies of the enemy of Christ are also dispersed. He was the one, who strutted around with the writings of the Gentiles, which were rightly scattered by the voices of the just.

Which tongue will be able to recount your teachings, which were hidden, and profane, and pernicious to the souls? Or the prediction of your ventriloquist prophetess, O John by the false name, who was truly a forerunner of the Antichrist, Satan?[20]

It was not opportune for you, O falsely named, to be called by such a name,[21] but rather Pythagoras, and Chronos, and Apollos, or any of those other gods, whose life you imitated, and in whose profanities you took delight.

θ We faithful, let us all adore the eternal, omnipotent and incomprehensible Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and let us celebrate them with divine praises without confusion (*asynchytōs*), shouting: Holy, holy, holy you are, O God.

θ' Holy Parent of God, Mother and Virgin, you who are celebrated and glorified by hymns, free from all crimes us, who venerate your immaculate birth; indeed, we do not have any other refuge save you, O divine bride.

Ode 8

Let us rejoice in a prophetic manner, and let us exult, all we faithful. This is indeed the day when Christ the Word gave back to the church his own stole.

They were arrayed like an army against the form of Christ, Lezios and John of equal fury, the fellow of Belial, cutting the church into pieces with the axe of iniquity.

Who will not deplore the great audacity, seeing the divine image that is on the bronze door of the palace being hit with stones by evil men, according to the teaching of John?[22]

How did you fail to see, O blind and miserable man whose intellect was darkened, the world (*tēn hyp'ouranon*) beautified with the image of Christ, and instead alone retained the mind (*to phronēma*) of the Jews?

You thought to eliminate entirely from the churches of God Christ's image resplendent with flesh (*sarkolampē*), and that of all the saints; but the divine grace destroyed your tyranny.

The fierce Lezios, together with John—the deserters of piety—lawlessly asserted that the holy relics of the saints and their images should not be worshipped at all.

θ All piously worshipping the divine principal author of all in three persons, we will praise the Father without beginning, and the co-eternal Son, and the resplendent Spirit.

θ' O Lady, you alone are the true bridge of the Christians, glory of the faithful, and their refuge, helping all and freeing them from all dangers.

Ode 9

Clap your hands, O people; choirs of the Fathers, hasten; hermits, and those who are in the mountains, approach; come, you who in the past were deceived by the evil and impious John, to curse his magic arts and his predictions.

Rejoice, deserted and peopled lands, and you all mountains, distill sweetness, and you valleys, be full of gladness, because Christ the Word has given peace to those who are on the earth, and has given the unity of faith to the churches of God.

The God of revenges now acted freely, Christ was near, giving strength to the divine teachers so that they could with courage announce his return (*sygkatabasin*), and truly circumscribe his incarnation in the image.

O magnanimous God, how marvelous are your works! Who will try to measure your love of humanity? In what way did you resist and maintained control, failing to strike the evil-doers, when you saw your priests and monks being killed for your image?

O you, who established your church as indefectible, O Lord, so that the doors of Hades would not prevail upon her, do grant your piece to your people, so that we all with a fervid soul may venerate you and praise you with one expression of praise (*doxologia*).

An anathema may be cast, O Lord, against those who do not venerate the image of your incarnation, first of all John, and then Anthony, and the impious Theodore, Theodotos, and the other deserters of the faith.

O Lord, who gave your peace to your apostles, give us all now tranquility, bringing back with your hand those who are scattered; and like sheep of the Word (*logika probata*), count them with the flock of your holy church.

θ I glorify the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, one nature (*physin*) in three hypostases, an undivided essence that is distinct by way of the Persons (*prosōpois*), reigning together, having created everything, omnipotent, having perfect command, containing everything.

θ' You (Virgin) helper of all, refuge and protection, do show that you can intercede for all those who take refuge in you, and that you defeat the impious ones by means of the power of your Son; since indeed, as Mother, you can do all things.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. See Leonid Ouspensky, *Theology of the Icon* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992), 2:273. Joseph of Volokolamsk (1439/40–1515), also known as Joseph of Volotsk, was an important monastic thinker and reformer from Muscovite Russia; he is well known for disputes with St. Nilus of Soras (1433–1508) on the issue of monastic landownership and for his role in opposing the heresy of the Judaizers. According to tradition, he composed the *Message to an Iconographer* to instruct and encourage the famous painter Dionysius of Moscow (1445–1505), who in 1481 had painted the frescoes of the Dormition Cathedral in the Moscow Kremlin, and between 1484 and 1486 came with his *artel'* (a retinue of co-workers) to decorate the monastery of St. Joseph. In the words of Ouspensky, the author of this text views sacred iconography as a form of art that had to be characterized by "a perfect fusion of dogmatic content, inner prayer, and artistic creation" (see Ouspensky, *Theology of the Icon*). While *The Message to an Iconographer* has not been fully translated into English, the Russian text is available in N. K. Goleizovskii, "The Message to an Iconographer and Echoes of Hesychasm in Russian Painting," *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* 26 (Moscow, 1965).

2. John Damascene's chief works on the question of iconoclasm are his three treatises on the icons; see John of Damascus, *Three Treatises on the Divine Images*, trans. Andrew Louth (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003).

3. For a more detailed overview of Theodore's life, see Roman Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite: The Ordering of Holiness*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

4. Biographical information about Theodore is much more readily available than in the case of John Damascene, whose land of birth—Syria—had already fallen under the sway of Islam and was removed from the religious and cultural developments of the capital. See Andrew Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 3–15.

5. The versions of the *Vita* can be found in the *Patrologia Graeca* of Migne, 99:113–327. Roman Cholij notes that with "hagiography being designed for edification, not information," the chronology of these lives is "often handled artificially in order to give greater scope for the activities of the hero, with bias and misinformation not infrequently coloring the account." Cholij claims however that "a discerning reading" of these texts can still provide useful insights. See Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite*, 8.

6. This text is available in Christian van de Vorst, ed., "La Translation de saint Théodore Studite et St. Joseph de Thessalonique," *Analecta Bollandiana* 32 (1913): 50–61. This text rectifies some of the information contained in the *Vita* and corroborates a letter on Theodore's death addressed by Theodore's disciple Naukratios to a number of monastic communities.

7. Plato is the addressee of the *Letter to His Own Father Plato* on the subject of icon veneration.

8. For the two catechetical collections, see J. Cozza-Luzi, ed., *Sancto Theodori Studitae Sermones, Magnae Catecheseos* (Rome: A. Mai. Nova Patrum Biblioteca 9/2, 1888); *Sancto Theodori Studitae Sermones, Parvae Catecheseos* (Rome: A. Mai. Nova Patrum Biblioteca 9/2, 1888); a French translation of the latter was Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, ed., *Théodore Stoudite: Petites Catéchès*, trans. by Anne-Marie Mohr (Paris: Migne, 1993).

9. See Alonso J. A. Fuentes, *El divorcio de Constantino VI y la doctrina matrimonial de San Teodoro Estudita* (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1984).

10. Alas, Irene's involvement in this and other palace coups would not stop Theodore from hailing her as a saint because of her later support for the legitimacy of icon veneration. See "La vie de l'impératrice Sainte Irène," ed. F. Halkin, *Analecta Bollandiana* 106 (1988): 5–27.

11. See his *Epistula 53*, in Georgios Fatouros, *Theodori Studitae Epistulae, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 31/1, 31/2 (Berlin and New York, 1992). This series of events marked a major shift in the application of *oikonomia* to matrimonial questions in the Eastern churches, whose position increasingly diverged from the stricter approach of the West; see Alonso J. A. Fuentes, "'Oikonomia' en la iglesia bizantina ante el divorcio de Constantino VI," in *Hispania Christiana: Estudios en honor del J. Orlandis Rovira* 24 (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1988): 239–55.

12. An account of the Bulgar wars before 813, stopping shortly before Leo V's public profession of iconoclasm, can be found in the chronicles of Theophanes the Confessor; see Cyril Mango, trans., *The Chronicles of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History (AD 284–813)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). The reign of Leo V is chronicled by the Scriptor Incertus in his *Historia de Leonae Bardae Armenii Filio*, included in Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia*, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonn, 1842), 335–62. For a short summary, see Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite*, 53–62.

13. See John Bagnell Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (AD 802–867)* (London, 1912; rep. Charleston, SC: Nabu Press, 2010), 56–57.

14. See Joan M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 55–58; Warren Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival: 780–842* (Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press, 1988), 207–14.

15. In *Epistula* 71, Theodore accused the new patriarch of acting illegally, as he was unilaterally subverting the decision of the council fathers. See also Thomas Pratsch, *Theodoros Studites (759–826): Zwischen Dogma und Pragma: Der Abt des Studiosklosters in Konstantinopel im Spannungsfeld von Patriarch, Kaiser, und eigenem Anspruch*, Berliner Byzantinistische Studien 4 (Frankfurt am Main, 1998), 204–43.

16. A more detailed chronicle of the last years of Theodore's life can be found in the *Vita Theodori Studitae B* (PG 99, 325d–328a), even if the reliability of this text has been challenged: see van de Vorst, "La Translation de S. Théodore Studite et de S. Joseph de Thessalonique," AnBoll 32 (1913): 439–47.

17. Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite*, 25.

18. On the "constructive" use of earlier sources by late Patristic authors, see Andrew Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, The Early Church Fathers (New York: Routledge, 1996), 19–33.

19. See Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 31–38, 84–89.

20. See Antoine Guillaumont, *Les Kephalaia Gnostika d'Évagre Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens* (Paris: Seuil, 1962), 124–70; John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987), 47–58.

21. See Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 174–78.

22. See Charly Clard, *Les théories relatives au culte des images chez les auteurs grecs du IIe siècle après Jésus-Christ* (Paris: Fontemoing and Cie, 1915), 24–30, 46–62.

23. Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, Fragment 77, in *Contra los Cristianos: Recopilación de Fragmentos, Traducción*, trans. E. A. Ramos Jurado et al. (Cádiz: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cádiz, 2006).

24. Celsus, *Sermo Verus*, II, 3, 31–36, in Horacio Lona, *Die "Wahre Lehre" des Kelsos* (Freiburg: Herder, 2005).

25. See, for instance, Clement of Alexandria, *Pedagogos*, 3, 1 (PG 8: 555–60), on the nature of images and "true beauty."

26. Origen, *De Principiis* I, 1, 8 (PG 11: 128–30).

27. The literature on Evagrios is vast and constantly growing. See Evagrios Pontikos, *Ad Monachos*, trans. and ed. Jeremy Driscoll, Ancient

Writers (Mahwah, NJ: Newman Press, 2003); Robert Sinkewicz, *Evagrius of Pontus: The Greek Ascetic Corpus*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). For the *Philokalia*, see vol. 1 of *The Philokalia: The Complete Text compiled by St. Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth*, ed. G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware (London: Faber and Faber, 1979). Volume 1 contains four texts by Evagrios: *Outline Teaching on Asceticism and Stillness in the Solitary Life*, *Texts on Discrimination in respect of Passions and Thoughts*, some extracts from the *Texts on Watchfulness*, and finally the *153 Texts on Prayer*. Further texts by Evagrios on the theme of spiritual practice were published by Jeremy Driscoll in *Steps to Spiritual Perfection: Studies on Spiritual Progress in Evagrius Ponticus* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005). An interesting overview of Evagrios's theological system can be found in Julia Konstantinovsky, *Evagrios: The Making of a Gnostic* (London: Ashgate, 2009).

28. Elisabeth Clarke, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

29. In *Philokalia*, 1:38–52; in the *Patrologia Graeca*, see *De Diversis Malignis Cogitationibus*, (PG 79: 1199–1234), though Migne attributes this work to Nilus of Sinai.

30. For instance, angelic thoughts about gold will recall how in Exodus 25:22–39 gold is used to cast the candlestick, the censers, and the vessels for the tabernacle of the Ark of the Covenant, whereas demonic thoughts will "shamelessly suggest the acquisition of physical gold." See Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination in Respect of Passions and Thoughts*, 7, in *Philokalia*, 1:42–43. Evagrios admits the possibility of merely "human" thoughts, which in this case would bring the image of gold to the mind without any attendant passion or desire, but does not ascribe much importance to them.

31. Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination*, 2, in *Philokalia*, 1:38–39.

32. According to Evagrios, the first stage in the ascent toward the divine reality is the practice of discernment of spirits, whereby the individual learns how to distinguish the angelic or demonic origin of thoughts. As the Greek term *diakrisis* derives from the verb *krinō* (to judge), another possible translation would be "adjudication": the practitioner would pass a judgment on the origin of the thought.

33. Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination*, 3, in *Philokalia*, 1:39.

34. Gal 3:28.

35. Col 3:10–11.

36. Mark the Ascetic, *On the Spiritual Law*, 139, in *Philokalia*, 1:119.

37. Matt 5:28.

38. Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, 56, in *Philokalia* 1:62. This text can be found in the *Patrologia Graeca* as *De Oratione* (PG 79: 1166–98), and it is also attributed to Nilus of Sinai.

39. Evagrios, *On Prayer*, 69, in *Philokalia*, 1:62.

40. Evagrios, *On Prayer*, 67–68, in *Philokalia*, 1:62.

41. In his chronicles composed between 440 and 443, Sozomenos narrates the destruction of the Temple of Serapis in Alexandria (the so-called Serapeum) that took place in 391; see Sozomenos, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 7, 15 (PG 67, 1451–58). News of these events would have reached Evagrios and the other monastic communities in the desert.

42. What we ordinarily call "souls" are thus the *noes* that dwell in the world of multiplicity and have "descended into the realm of practical activity." Evagrios, *Kephalaia Gnostika*, III, 28 (S2).

43. Ibid., IV, 58 (S2).

44. Ibid., II, 53.

45. Ibid., II, 5.

46. See Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius: The Coherence of His Thought* (Oxford: Routledge, 1998). A different theology of the atonement that also emphasizes the centrality of Christ's body can also be found in Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica* (PG 45: 77–78).

47. Evagrios, *Kephalaia Gnostika*, II, 53; IV, 8.

48. On the sixth-century condemnation of Origenism and its considerable differences from Origen's own theological vision, see Antoine Guillaumont, *Les Kephalaia Gnostika d'Évagre Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens*, 124–70; also Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 47–68.

49. See also M. Anastos, "The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754," in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of A.M. Friend, Jr.*, ed. Kurt Weitzmann (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 177–88.

50. See Leo D. Davis, *The History of the First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their Histories and Theologies* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 180–92.

51. Sarah Coakley, "What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does it Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian Definition," in *An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, David Kendall, SJ, and Gerald O'Collins, SJ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 143–63.

52. John McGuckin, "Introduction," in Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 39–74.

53. For an overview of Leontios's Christology, see David B. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology* (Washington, 1970), 1–7. Other important sources for his thought are J. P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz: Studien zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen, Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur—und Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 7, 3 (Paderborn, 1908), 148–62; Silas Rees, "The Literary Activity of Leontius of Byzantium," *J. Theol. Stud.* 19 (1968): 229–42; the *Vita Sabae* by Cyril of Scythopolis (525–38), published in

Christian Writers (Mahwah, NJ: Newman Press, 2003); Robert Sinkewicz, *Evagrius of Pontus: The Greek Ascetic Corpus*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). For the *Philokalia*, see vol. 1 of *The Philokalia: The Complete Text compiled by St. Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth*, ed. G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware (London: Faber and Faber, 1979). Volume 1 contains four texts by Evagrios: *Outline Teaching on Asceticism and Stillness in the Solitary Life*, *Texts on Discrimination in respect of Passions and Thoughts*, some extracts from the *Texts on Watchfulness*, and finally the *153 Texts on Prayer*. Further texts by Evagrios on the theme of spiritual practice were published by Jeremy Driscoll in *Steps to Spiritual Perfection: Studies on Spiritual Progress in Evagrius Ponticus* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005). An interesting overview of Evagrios's theological system can be found in Julia Konstantinovsky, *Evagrios: The Making of a Gnostic* (London: Ashgate, 2009).

28. Elisabeth Clarke, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

29. In *Philokalia*, 1:38–52; in the *Patrologia Graeca*, see *De Diversis Malignis Cogitationibus*, (PG 79: 1199–1234), though Migne attributes this work to Nilus of Sinai.

30. For instance, angelic thoughts about gold will recall how in Exodus 25:22–39 gold is used to cast the candlestick, the censers, and the vessels for the tabernacle of the Ark of the Covenant, whereas demonic thoughts will "shamelessly suggest the acquisition of physical gold." See Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination in Respect of Passions and Thoughts*, 7, in *Philokalia*, 1:42–43. Evagrios admits the possibility of merely "human" thoughts, which in this case would bring the image of gold to the mind without any attendant passion or desire, but does not ascribe much importance to them.

31. Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination*, 2, in *Philokalia*, 1:38–39.

32. According to Evagrios, the first stage in the ascent toward the divine reality is the practice of discernment of spirits, whereby the individual learns how to distinguish the angelic or demonic origin of thoughts. As the Greek term *diakrisis* derives from the verb *krinō* (to judge), another possible translation would be "adjudication": the practitioner would pass a judgment on the origin of the thought.

33. Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination*, 3, in *Philokalia*, 1:39.

34. Gal 3:28.

35. Col 3:10–11.

36. Mark the Ascetic, *On the Spiritual Law*, 139, in *Philokalia*, 1:119.

37. Matt 5:28.

38. Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, 56, in *Philokalia* 1:62. This text can be found in the *Patrologia Graeca* as *De Oratione* (PG 79: 1166–98), and it is also attributed to Nilus of Sinai.

39. Evagrios, *On Prayer*, 69, in *Philokalia*, 1:62.

40. Evagrios, *On Prayer*, 67–68, in *Philokalia*, 1:62.

41. In his chronicles composed between 440 and 443, Sozomenos narrates the destruction of the Temple of Serapis in Alexandria (the so-called Serapeum) that took place in 391; see Sozomenos, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 7, 15 (PG 67, 1451–58). News of these events would have reached Evagrios and the other monastic communities in the desert.

42. What we ordinarily call "souls" are thus the *noes* that dwell in the world of multiplicity and have "descended into the realm of practical activity." Evagrios, *Kephalaia Gnostika*, III, 28 (S2).

43. Ibid., IV, 58 (S2).

44. Ibid., II, 53.

45. Ibid., II, 5.

46. See Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasios: The Coherence of His Thought* (Oxford: Routledge, 1998). A different theology of the atonement that also emphasizes the centrality of Christ's body can also be found in Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica* (PG 45: 77–78).

47. Evagrios, *Kephalaia Gnostika*, II, 53; IV, 8.

48. On the sixth-century condemnation of Origenism and its considerable differences from Origen's own theological vision, see Antoine Guillaumont, *Les Kephalaia Gnostika d'Évagre Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens*, 124–70; also Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 47–68.

49. See also M. Anastos, "The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754," in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of A.M. Friend, Jr.*, ed. Kurt Weitzmann (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 177–88.

50. See Leo D. Davis, *The History of the First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their Histories and Theologies* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990), 180–92.

51. Sarah Coakley, "What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does it Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian Definition," in *An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, David Kendall, SJ, and Gerald O'Collins, SJ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 143–63.

52. John McGuckin, "Introduction," in Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 39–74.

53. For an overview of Leontios's Christology, see David B. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology* (Washington, 1970), 1–7. Other important sources for his thought are J. P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzans: Studies zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen, Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur—und Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 7, 3 (Paderborn, 1908): 148–62; Silas Rees, "The Literary Activity of Leontius of Byzantium," *J. Theol. Stud.* 19 (1968): 229–42; the *Vita Sabae* by Cyril of Scythopolis (525–58), published in

Eduard Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Reihe 4, Band XLIX, Heft 2 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1939), 85–200. Two important articles by Brian Daley, SJ, are "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium," *J. Theol. Stud.* 27, no. 2 (1976): 333–69, and "A Richer Union: Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ," SP 24 (1993): 239–65.

54. Leontios of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos Libri Tres* (PG 86: 1276–81A).

55. Ibid. (PG 86: 1281B–85).

56. Ibid. (PG 86: 1285D–1288A).

57. Ibid. (PG 86: 1288D–1289A).

58. Ibid. Instead of being used to capture an infra-trinitarian web of relationality, the term *hypostasis* is used to suggest two opposed "infra-christological" relations.

59. Ibid. (PG 86: 1304A).

60. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium*, 184–85.

61. Leontios of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos Libri Tres* (PG 86: 1277).

62. Ibid., (PG 86: 1280B). Of course, the two sets of divine properties continue to remain grounded in their respective natures.

63. For a chronology of Maximos's life and works, see Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Cosmic Liturgy: The Universe According to Maximos the Confessor*, trans. Fr. B. Daley, SJ (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2003). As with Evagrios, the secondary literature on Maximos is constantly growing. Some fundamental works that focus on Maximos's spiritual theology, as opposed to the monothelite controversy, are Jean-Claude Larchet, *La Divinization de l'Homme Selon Saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris: Cerf, 1996); Lars Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos: The Vision of St. Maximus the Confessor* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), and *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, 2nd ed. (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1995); Adam Cooper, *The Body in St. Maximus the Confessor: Holy Body, Wholly Deified* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

64. Maximos the Confessor, *Ep.* 12 (PG 91: 224A, 469D).

65. On Maximos's theology of Christ's composite subjectivity, see von Balthasar, *Cosmic Liturgy*, 31, 250–51; see also Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator*, 21–47.

66. Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 7 (PG 91: 1084A).

67. Maximos, *ThPol.* 7 (PG 91: 85A); the text from the Pseudo-Denys is *Ep.* 4 (PG 3: 1072AC). See also Thomas Cattoi, "An Evagrian Hypostasis? Leontios of Byzantium and the "Composite Subjectivity" of the Person of Christ," in *Studia Patristica* 68 (2013): 133–47.

68. Maximos the Confessor, *Ep.* 12 (PG 91: 496C). On the question of the mode of the union late Chalcedonian Christology, see also Brian E. Daley, "Nature and the 'Mode of Union': Late Patristic Models for the Personal Unity of Christ," in Davis, Kendall, and O'Collins, *The Incarnation: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*, 164–97.

69. Germanos of Constantinople, *Epistulae Dogmaticae* (PG 98 135–83).

70. Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I* (PG 100: 280–332); Nikephoros would later formally condemn the theological positions of Constantine V. See also Theodore's *Antirrheticus* I, 3.

71. Theodore will discuss this issue in *Some Questions Posed to the Iconoclasts*, IX, 132.

72. See the same argument in *Antirrheticus* 2, 7–8; 2, 38; 3A, 42.

73. On the Council of Hieria, see Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 181; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 3, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom* (600–1700) (Chicago, 1974), 113; Milton V. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815," DOP 8 (1954): 153–60.

74. Evagrios, *Kephalaia Gnostika*, II, 53.

75. See also Milton V. Anastos, "The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754," in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of A.M. Friend, Jr.*, ed. Kurt Weitzmann (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955).

76. See Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus I* (PG 100, 272).

77. Ibid. (PG 100, 628); Theodore, for his part, will note in his *Antirrheticus* 3A, 17, that Christ is circumscribable because he comes from a "circumscribable" mother.

78. Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, 67–68, in *Philokalia*, 1:63.

79. *Antirrheticus* I, 7; 1, 10.

80. Ibid., 1, 4; 3A 15; 3A 17; 3A, 34.

81. Ibid., 3A, 3; 3A, 58.

82. Ibid., 1, 2; 1, 3; 1, 12.

83. Ibid., 1, 12; *Some Questions Posed to the Iconoclasts*, XIV.

84. See Evagrios, *Kephalaia Gnostika*, 3, 6–8; 4, 9; 5, 69; 6, 20; Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 7 (PG 91: 1089B; 1097B).

85. Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 31 (PG 91: 1276B); *Q.Th* 63 (CCSG 22: 173).

86. Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 38 (PG 91: 1330BC); *Ep.* 33 (PG 91: 627); also Walter Völker, *Maximos the Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens* (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1965), 410–32.

87. See, for instance, Jean-Michel Garrigues, *La Charité: Avenir Divine de l'Homme* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1976).

88. See Maximos the Confessor, *Liber Asceticus*, 34 (PG 90: 340b).

89. In a passage of the *Capita Theologiae et Oeconomiae*, Maximos notes that in virtue of the shared divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the person who follows the divine commandments becomes the dwelling place of the

three persons of the Trinity (PG 90: 1156d). This trinitarian dimension of holiness, however, is always subordinate to the christological aspect. See *Antirrheticus* I, 6.

90. Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 31 (PG 91: 1276c); also *Amb.* 48 (PG 91: 1364c).

91. Maximos the Confessor, *Ep.* 2 (PG 91: 408a). An English translation of this epistle is included in Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 84–94.

92. Maximos the Confessor, *Capita Theologiae et Oeconomiae* 2, 30, in *Philokalia*, 2:145 (PG 90: 1137d).

93. See Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 41 (PG 91: 1304–12A); also Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, 155–61.

94. On Paul of Samosata, see McGuckin, "Introduction," 18–39.

95. Maximos connects the church's liturgical actions with Christ's cosmic healing and preservation of ontological difference through the mystery of the hypostatic union. See Maximos the Confessor, *Mystagogia* (658–718); also Thomas Cattoi, "The Symphonic Church: Chalcedonian Themes in Maximos the Confessor's Liturgical Theology," *Studia Patristica* 48 (2010): 123–29.

96. *Antirrheticus* I, 17–18.

97. The Greek text of Theodore's *Antirrhetici* can be found in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, alongside the usual Latin translation. *Antirrheticus* I is in PG 99, 327–52; *Antirrheticus* 2 is in PG 99, 351–88; *Antirrheticus* 3 is in PG 99, 387–436.

98. Catherine Roth, *On the Holy Icon: St Theodore the Studite* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981), 15.

99. See, for instance, *Letter to His Own Father Plato*, par. 2; *Antirrheticus* I, 16.

100. *Antirrheticus* I, 1; 2, 4.

101. Ibid., 1, 1. If the three persons of the Trinity are known to us distinctly in virtue of their specific properties, Theodore also stresses that one can distinguish between the humanity and the divinity of the incarnate Christ in virtue of their distinct set of *idiômata*; see *Antirrheticus*, I, 3; 3, 22–23; *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, 1.

102. On the Council, see Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 181; also Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 113.

103. Throughout the whole *Antirrhetici*, as well as in his other writings, Theodore plays on the double meaning of the verb *graphô* ("to write," but also "to paint an icon"), as well as of its cognates, such as *perigraphê* ("circumscription," but also "representation"), *perigraptos* ("circumscribed," but also "capable of representation"), *aperigraptos* ("uncircumscribable," but also "not capable of representation"). To admit Christ's circumscribability is thus to admit that Christ can be represented (and worshiped) in an image, and vice versa. See, for instance, *Antirrheticus* 2, 8; 2, 48; 3A, 4–5; 3A, 46–48; 3A, 50.

104. *Antirrheticus* I, 2; 3, 53.

105. See, for instance, Maximos the Confessor, *Disputatio cum Pyrro* (PG 91: 287–360); *Capita Theologiae et Oeconomiae* (PG 90: 1083–1177).

106. See also *Refutations and Subversions*, IX–X (in response to the poem by "Sergios"); *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, III.

107. See Davis, *The History of the First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 180–92; Coakley, "What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does It Not?" 147.

108. See *Antirrheticus* 3A, 22–23, where the iconoclast accuses those who venerate images of falling back into Nestorianism. In the second part of *Refutations and Subversions*, Theodore debunks the claim of the iconoclasts to be in continuity with the earlier councils: see *Refutations and Subversions*, XXX.

109. *Antirrheticus* I, 3; see also *Antirrheticus* 3A, 12–13.

110. Similarly, in the spiritual theology of Maximos the Confessor, deification does not deprive men of their human individuality, although their assimilation of the divine properties ensures that their human nature starts functioning "in a divine manner." See Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 7 (PG 91: 1088C).

111. In *Antirrheticus* I, 12, Theodore observes that, in the hypostatic union, the divine nature does not assume those properties that are "unsuited" to it (*ta anoikeia*). This is an important qualification; if it were not so, the teaching on the communication of the two properties would have untenable consequences, such as the mortality of the divine nature (or conversely, the omnipresence or omniscience of Christ's humanity).

112. It is interesting to note that, in more recent times, theologian John Hick (1922–2012) rejects the *communicatio idiomatum* precisely on the grounds put forth by the iconoclasts, as he argues that the exchange of properties between humanity and divinity would result in the ascription of contradictory attributes to the same nature. See John Hick, *The Metaphor of God Incarnate: Christology in a Pluralistic Age* (Louisville, KY: Westminster Press, 2006), 47–61.

113. See Lars Koen, "Partitive Exegesis in Cyril of Alexandria's Gospel according to St. John," in *Studia Patristica* 25 (1991): 115–22.

114. *Antirrheticus* I, 4.

115. Ibid.

116. See also ibid., 2, 7–8.

117. See also ibid., 2, 38; 3A, 42; *Some Questions Posed to the Iconoclasts*, XIII.

118. See *Antirrheticus*, I, 7.

119. Hab 2:18.

120. Porphyry, *Contra Christianos*, Fragment 77.

121. Theodore goes back to this point in his discussion of the iconoclastic poems: see *Refutation and Subversions*, XV, as Theodore responds to "Stephanos" second poem.

122. See also *Antirrheticus* 3A: 15. It is important to remember how Neo-Platonic thought also distinguished between the human nature and the human *genos*: while the former is the ontological matrix of our substance, which unfolds in time in different manners according to the choices made by the individual subject, the latter is the set of all those subjects that are endowed with the same human nature. It is important to remember that Christ assumed our common human nature, but he did not assume the human species; if he had, he would have become incarnate as many times as there have been or will be members of the human race. See Sara L. Rappe, "Explanation in 'Enneads' VI. 7.1–15," in *Neoplatonism and Nature: Studies in Plotinus' Enneads,'* ed. Michael Wagner (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2001), 71–99.

123. *Antirrheticus* 1, 7.

124. See Theodore's critical commentary to the poem by "John" in *Refutations and Subversions*, I–V; *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, III.

125. See *Antirrheticus* 1, 36. Theodore presents Old Testament practices as a *skiagraphia* (foreshadowing) of the new covenant, choosing the term that was used for Greek vase painting whereby figures and scenes emerged from a black background; see Plato, *Phaedrus*, 69.

126. See *Antirrheticus* 1, 7; also 2, 24–5.

127. The deliberations of the Quinisext Council are also mentioned when Theodore critiques the iconoclastic profession of faith in his *Refutations and Subversions*: see *Refutations and Subversions*, XXIX.

128. *Antirrheticus* 1, 10; on this issue, see also Nikephoros, *Antirrhetici* (PG 100, 272). The contention on the part of the iconoclasts was that the Eucharist alone could be considered an image of Christ, as it was not distinct from Christ in terms of essence. See also *Antirrheticus* 2, 25, and the discussion of natural and artificial image in the *Letter to His Father Plato*.

129. Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 19 (PG 31: 509).

130. Interestingly, *Antirrheticus* 1, 17 insists that "hearing" is equal to "sight."

131. *Antirrheticus* 1, 12.

132. This language is reminiscent of Leontios's discussion of Christ's subjectivity; see Leontios of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos Libri Tres* (PG 86, 1285d–88a). Leontios, however, thought that the hypostasis of the incarnate Word emerged out of some sort of relational dialectic, whereas in this case Theodore is talking of the ontological relationship between the image and its prototype.

133. See, for instance, *Antirrheticus* 2, 7.

134. See Ibid. In *Refutations and Subversions* XXX–XXXVIII, Theodore notes that the church only defines dogmas when the need arises to counter some heretical teaching.

135. *Antirrheticus* 2, 7–8.

136. Ibid., 2, 16; see also *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, I. The point is that the properties are present in the prototype "in an eminent manner" and are therefore transmitted to the image.

137. *Antirrheticus* 2, 15; also 1, 15.

138. Pseudo-Denys, *De Eccl. Hier.* 4, 3, 1 (PG 3, 473); Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 42, 4 (PG 31, 608); Athanasios, *Contra Arios* 3, 5 (PG 26, 332).

139. *Antirrheticus* 3A, 5; 3A, 8; 3A, 43: 3A, 51.

140. Ibid., 3A, 15–17.

141. At the very beginning of the first *Antirrheticus*, Theodore mentions a work by the name of *Steleutikos*, which is seemingly lost. The theme of iconoclasm is also treated in some of Theodore's letters; see G. Fatouros, *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 31/1, 31/2, Series Berolinensis (Berlin: 1992).

142. Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 219–23; John A. McGuckin, "The Theology of Images and the Legitimation of Power in Eighth Century Byzantium," SVTQ 37 (1993): 39–58.

143. The *Seven Chapters* can be found in PG 99: 485–98.

144. The *Questions Posed by Theodore to the Iconoclasts* can be found in PG 99: 72–486.

145. See *Antirrheticus* 3A, 4–7; 3A, 12.

146. The *Letter to Plato* can be found in PG 99: 499–506.

147. See Pseudo-Denys, *De Eccl. Hier.* 4, 3, 1 (PG 3: 473).

148. The *Refutations and Subversions* can be found in PG 99: 436–78.

149. The poem is at the very beginning of *Refutations and Subversions*; for Theodore's critical commentary, see *Refutations and Subversions*, I–V.

150. The poem is the third poetic composition in *Refutations and Subversions*; for Theodore's critical commentary, see *Refutations and Subversions*, IX–XI.

151. Num 21:6–9.

152. Exod 17:8–16.

153. On the Council of Hieria, see again Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 181; also Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 3:112–14 for the context of these assemblies.

154. See *Refutations and Subversions*, XIX–XXVII.

155. See ibid., XXX.

156. Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, 67–68, in *Philokalia*, 1:63.

157. 1 John 1:1–3.

158. On the Triumph of Orthodoxy, see Henry R. Percival, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series. 14: The Seven Ecumenical Councils* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 576; Metropolitan Kallistos (Timothy) Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1964), 38.

159. This *Celebratory Canon* is included in an appendix to this volume; the Greek text can be found in PG 99: 1767–80. For another version, see the

texts for the First Sunday of Great Lent in Mother Maria and Kallistos Ware, trans., *The Lenten Triodion* (Waymart, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2002). John is most likely John the Grammarian (837–43), who as patriarch had authored some iconoclastic works.

160. Maximos's teaching of dythelitism was accepted as official church doctrine at the Third Council of Constantinople (682); see Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 279–84.

First Refutation of the Iconoclasts

1. *Kenophōnia* is a Pauline term indicating vain speech, or heresy: see 1 Tim 6:20: "O Timothy, preserve the deposit of faith, rejecting the defiled heresies (*kenophōnias*)"; 2 Tim 2:16: "flee the accursed heresies (*kenophōnias*)."

2. An echo of Eccl 3:7: "There is a time to talk, and one to be silent." All citations from the Old Testament are from the Septuagint.

3. Theodore is resorting to the customary humility *topos*.

4. The reference to Gregory of Nazianzos, like later references to the same or to works by Basil of Caesarea that are scattered throughout the *Antirrhetici*, cannot be traced with any certainty. While it is possible that Theodore may have had access to works by the Cappadocian fathers that are no longer extant, it is also clear that Theodore is often quoting other authors from memory. As a result, his citations are often approximate; at times, the original text is slightly modified to fit the flow of his argument.

5. This work is not included in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*. The title *Stēliteutikos* comes from *stēliteuo* ("to write on a stele, so as to expose to public infamy"), clearly indicating the apologetic intent of the work.

6. Ps 67(68):11.

7. Faith, adoration, and honor are used synonymously to indicate the one adoration that is due to the Three Persons of the Trinity in virtue of their shared divine nature.

8. Theodore tends to use *physis* to indicate nature, and he alternates between *hypostasis* and *prosōpon* to indicate the person. On occasion, he will also use the term *oikeōsis* (likeness) as synonymous with hypostasis.

9. The term can also mean "a flow of words," or "context," but in this passage it indicates the "rule of faith" that found a dogmatic articulation at the councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon.

10. The notion that the different hypostases of the Trinity, as well as the two natures of Christ, are known to us by their specific set of properties (*idiotēs*) is a recurrent theme throughout Theodore's writings.

11. This citation is from the decrees of the iconoclastic Council of Hieria, 754. See John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987), 180–83.

12. Throughout all his writings on the subject of iconoclasm, Theodore will play with the fact that the verb *graphō* ("to write") is also customarily used to indicate the painting of sacred images. As a result, the adjectives *perigraptos* and *aperigraptos* ("circumscribable" and "uncircumscribable") will also be used to mean "passible of representation" (which could be rendered as "portrayable") and "not passible of representation" (or "non-portrayable").

13. 2 Cor 6:14–15.

14. 2 Kgs 23:13. In other words, if the veneration of the idols (= the effects) were legitimate, one might as well venerate the pagan deities themselves (= their causes).

15. Rom 1:25.

16. Theodore wishes to emphasize that, no matter which of the various pagan gods one may worship, the sin of idolatry remains the same.

17. The first of numerous references to the traditional distinction between *theologia* and *oikonomia*; the first concerns the divine realm in itself, the latter refers to God's plan for the world and, more specifically, to the mystery of the incarnation.

18. In the Origenist worldview, the *epinoiai* are the characteristics of the eternal Logos; see Origen's reflection on the "titles" of Christ in his *Comm. in Joannem* (PG 14: 21–828). In this case, however, the term is used more broadly to indicate philosophical reasoning.

19. The blurring of the boundaries between the two natures that would be the consequence of this monophysitism would make the divine and the human natures cognitively inaccessible to humanity, as their distinct properties.

20. The allegation of the iconoclasts is that Theodore's position is akin to Nestorianism, as it would drive a wedge between the humanity, which can be represented, and the divinity, which transcends representation. In Chalcedonian theology, the term *diairesis* indicates a difference that is a source of conflict, whereas the term *diaphora* indicates a difference that is a source of mutual integration. Maximos the Confessor, mindful of the Chalcedonian claim that in the hypostatic union the two natures exist without division (*adiairetōs*), claims that the event of the incarnation inaugurates a process of cosmic healing, whereby all instances of *diairesis* can turn into instances of *diaphora*; see *Amb.* 42 (PG 91: 1341–56).

21. The term has a sarcastic overtone, indicating a sophistical wish to dissent; see Plato, *Thaetetus*, 146.

22. The passage goes back to the theology of Cyril of Alexandria, especially his discussion of the communication of the idioms (*koinōnia idiomatōn*); see Cyril of Alexandria, *De Unitate Christi* (PG 75: 1254–1363); see also, Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ*, trans. John McGuckin (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995), esp. 49–55. Theodore is invoking the tradition of partitive exegesis of scripture, whereby certain statements are ascribed

to Christ's humanity and others to Christ's divinity, all the while affirming the unity of Christ's subjectivity.

23. The cognate *asynchytōs* is one of the four Chalcedonian adverbs characterizing the union of humanity and divinity in the hypostatic union; the other three are *adiairetōs*, *atreptōs*, and *achōristōs*. Theodore deliberately uses Chalcedonian language to stress that his emphasis on the difference (*diaphora*) between the natures is not a form of Nestorianism but is fully faithful to the orthodox tradition.

24. Theodore proves the invalidity of this syllogism by showing the falsity of both premises. Migne translates the expression *psilos anthrōpos* as "*nudus homo.*"

25. One could also read, "when you counter what is demonstrable with a lack of demonstration, and what is proved by logic with your lack of logic." According to the first reading, the iconoclasts bring forth flawed arguments; according to the second, the iconoclasts do not bring forth any arguments at all.

26. To deny the presence of a center of human subjectivity in Christ, Theodore is here deploying the argument developed by Leontios of Byzantium, who had emphasized the absence of an individual human hypostasis in Christ but, at the same time, had affirmed the necessary indwelling of all natures in a hypostasis, as natures were neither accidental realities nor entities "that could be contemplated in themselves"; see Leontios of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* (PG 86A: 1277CD). As noted in the introduction, Theodore inherited Leontios's discourse on anhypostasis via its Chalcedonian appropriation by Maximos the Confessor. Even more than Maximos, however, Theodore exploited Leontios's insight to affirm the paradoxical conclusion that Christ's universal human nature is actually concretely embodied in a particular individual with specific individuating characteristics that can be portrayed in an image.

27. The *agraptodocetae* emphasized anhypostasy to the point of denying that Christ's nature could be described at all; their position is exposed by St. Nikephoros of Constantinople (758–828) in his treatise, which is also known as *Antirrhetici*. See Nikephoros, *Antirrhetici* (PG 100: 628A); Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 187; also Thomas Cattoi, "Salvific Asymmetry: Anhypostasy and Icon Veneration in Theodore the Studite's *Antirrhetici*," in *Studia Patristica* 51 (2009): 181–94.

28. Theodore turns the accusation of Nestorianism upside down: it is actually his opponents who introduce an unnecessary wedge between the divinity and the humanity.

29. Exod 20:4–5.

30. Gal 3:23.

31. In other words, to those people (the Hebrews) who were entering into a covenant with the Godhead, who had not yet revealed his triune

nature. *Monarchia* is a term that the Cappadocians associate with the Father inasmuch as the Father was the cause (*aitia*) of the Trinity; see Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 28 (PG 36: 25–74). In this case, however, the term refers to the fact that God ruled over Israel as a monarch.

32. In the *Philokalia*, Evagrios opposes the *dianoia* (deductive reasoning) to the more intuitive character of the *nous*. *Dianoia*, which explores created reality, has to fade away before one may discern the Divine Mystery by means of the *nous*. See Evagrios, *Texts on Discrimination*, in *Philokalia*, ed. G. E. H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, and K. Ware (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), 1:38–52; also, *Antirrheticus* 3, 16. The claim that there were philosophical concepts that could express the reality of God fully can be traced back to the Eunomianism attacked by Gregory of Nyssa; see Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* (PG 45: 239–1122).

33. Isa 40:18. The Septuagint uses *homōiasis*, which is the term also used in Gen 1.

34. Exod 25:18–22.

35. The quotation is actually not from Leviticus but from Num 21:8–9 —another indication that Theodore is most likely quoting from memory.

36. John 3:14.

37. The passage echoes the allegorizing interpretation of Old Testament sacrifices in chapter 9 of the Letter to the Hebrews.

38. Hab 2:18. The passage in Habakkuk lambasts idolaters because they worship what they themselves have created. Again, the argument of the heretic appears to echo the Evagrian mistrust for images ascribing form and shape to the deity; see again Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, 56–57, 66–58, in *Philokalia*, 1:62–63. Clearly, for Theodore, the "noetic contemplation" posited by Evagrios as the highest stage of inner spiritual progress fails to take into account the irreversible change in the divine economy brought about by the event of the incarnation.

39. Jer 10:3–4.

40. Luke 14:11.

41. This tantalizing passage leaves us wondering how Theodore would connect the sacrament of baptism with the intellectual contemplation of Christ, as well as with the notion that Christ is shaped in us by the Holy Spirit. Alas, this topic is not addressed in any of his extant works. For the notion of repeated "incarnations" of Christ in us, see Maximos the Confessor, *Capita Theologiae et Oeconomiae* (PG 90: 1156d).

42. Heb 4:15.

43. As usual, the term *diaphora* is used to indicate a positive difference. See *Antirrheticus* 1, 3.

44. 1 Cor 1:18.

45. Gal 6:14.

46. This is a standard Aristotelian claim that we find, for instance,

Athanasios, *Contra Arios* (PG 26: 9–525); the study of creation (= the effect) leads us to a greater understanding of God (= the cause).

47. Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149).

48. Maximos the Confessor uses the term *diabainein* to indicate a motion that goes through something but does not let go of it; in other words, the spiritual interpretation of a scriptural passage goes beyond the literal meaning, but the literal meaning retains its value. Similarly, for Theodore, the honor that is ascribed to the image goes over to the prototype, even as the image itself continues to be worthy of veneration. See Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 20 (PG 91: 1236–42).

49. Once again, Theodore uses the term *diaphoroi* to indicate that the ontological distinction between different individuals is part of the divine plan; this remains the case even if in Christ there is only one hypostasis and as a result no such distinction is present.

50. *Eidos* indicates the set of all the hypostases that share the same nature; Migne translates here *species*, which can indicate appearance, but in this particular sense *eidos* could also be rendered as *genus*.

51. Luke 22:19.

52. This is the position developed by Constantine V Copronymous (718–75); see Nikephoros, *Antirrheticus* 1 (PG 100: 301C).

53. *Anepitimēton* is a *vox media* and could also mean "wondrous, irreproachable." According to this reading, Theodore would be using sarcasm against his opponents, saying, "Since it would not be appropriate to ignore any of your wondrous claims…"

54. Theodore uses the term "mystery" to indicate the sacrament of the Eucharist, but he also deploys it in a broader sense, including acts such as the carrying of branches on Palm Sunday, which the Western tradition would call "sacramentals." The Slavic tradition would use the term *maŭha* ("secret").

55. While Theodore uses *synkephalaiōsis*, Irenaeus of Lyon uses *anakephalaiōsis* to signify the same concept; Theodore emphasizes the sense of a plurality brought into a unity, while Irenaeus underscores how everything is brought together at a higher level. See Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses* 3.21.9–10; 3.22.3 (PG 7A 953–55; 957–58).

56. The sense seems to be that the celebration of the Eucharist is a sort of synecdoche, commemorating the whole of Christ's life through one specific action.

57. Theophany is the Eastern name for the Feast of the Epiphany, which however, differs from its Western counterpart as it commemorates the baptism of Christ in the Jordan.

58. *Theōria* usually indicates contemplation, but in this case the term is used to indicate some hidden or questionable insight.

59. Isa 10:23 (from the Septuagint version); Rom 9:28.

60. Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 19, "On the Forty Martyrs" (PG 31: 509).

61. This is in fact the position developed by some iconoclasts, who thought that only the Eucharist could be a real image of Christ. See Jaroslav Pelikan, *A History of the Development of Doctrine II: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1974), 108–9.

62. In this passage, Theodore uses *ousia* and *physis* as synonyms.

63. 2 Kgs 16:18.

64. This is the term used in the Nicene Creed to indicate that the Holy Spirit is worshiped with the Father and the Son (*simul adoratur*).

65. While the term *sarx* is used, and no mention is made of the soul of Christ, it would appear that *sarx* here indicates the whole of the humanity of Christ, as had arguably been the case in the writings of Athanasios; see David M. Gwynn, *Athanasius of Alexandria: Bishop, Theologian, Ascetic, Father* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 116–71, 185. In any case, in responding to this particular argument, Theodore does not accuse his opponents of Apollinarism.

66. *Synapheia* had been Nestorius's favorite term to indicate the association of the humanity and divinity in Christ. While the term as such had also been used by other authors whose orthodoxy was not in question (such as Basil of Caesarea in *Ep.* 210.5 or John Chrysostom in *Hom 11.2 in Johannem*), *synapheia* was eventually replaced by *hēnosis* to indicate the commingling of the natures in the hypostatic union; see Norman Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria* (London: Routledge, 2000), 130–75. See *Antirrheticus* 2, 38; *Some Questions Posed by the [Same] Theodore to the Iconoclasts*, 14.

67. In this passage, Theodore seems to restrict the scope of the *communicatio idiomatum* to preserve the concreteness of the humanity of Christ.

68. The hypostasis of the eternal Logos, as the locus of the *communicatio idiomatum*, is also the locus of Christ's suffering, which cannot possibly touch his divine nature.

69. In the sense that you will be even less justified to claim that the uncircumscribable divinity is actually present in the image. Migne points out that some manuscripts read "circumscribable" (*perigrapton*), but the thrust of the passage suggests "uncircumscribable" (*aperigrapton*).

70. In this context, the term indicates liturgical implements, or votive offerings.

71. If "natural union" entails a blurring of the two *physeis* and the emergence of a *tertium quid*, this conceptualization of the incarnation would be rejected as incompatible with Chalcedon, which preserves the two natures intact. In this case, however, Theodore seems to use "natural union" in an orthodox sense, suggesting that in the case of the image we do not have a natural union of any kind.

72. The term would associate "material depiction" with something that slithers on the ground or with a serpent, which of course symbolizes the devil.

73. John 4:24.

74. In this case, the "letter" indicates the inscription.

75. See Ezek 9:4: "Pass through the city, through Jerusalem, and put a cross [in the Septuagint, *to sēmeion*, which is often understood as a cross] on the foreheads of the men who sigh and groan over all the abominations that are committed in it."

76. Lev 26:1.

77. Theodore probably has in mind the decisions of the Quinisext Council of 692, where icons of the Father were forbidden, because they would presume to represent the invisible nature of God. He is saying here that in fact the iconoclast argument is correct if it is applied to the invisible nature of God. See Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 177–79.

78. Gen 1:26. Of course the distinction between the two terms is at the basis of the teaching of deification, but Theodore does not develop this line of argument; in fact, he insists here that the two terms mean the same thing.

79. Matt 22:20. Christ refers here to the image of the emperor on the coin, leading to the famous statement: "To God what is of God, and to Caesar, what is of Caesar."

80. Theodore does not seem to distinguish conceptually between the image of God that is given and that likeness of God that has to be achieved; as such, he also uses "icon" to indicate the divine likeness.

81. The Emperor Constantine V Copronymous supported iconoclasm, but he also opposed the veneration of saints altogether. See Pelikan, *A History of the Development of Doctrine II*, 110–12.

82. Some iconoclasts viewed themselves as following the example of the Maccabees, who had cleansed the temple of Jerusalem and thrown out idols that had found their way even into the Holy of Holies; see 1 Macc 4:36–59.

83. Exod 19:13; Heb 12:20. In Exodus, we are told that any beast that will touch the mountain of God shall be put to death; for Theodore, this indicates that iconoclasts are unworthy to enter the churches of God. See the penultimate anathema in the next paragraph; clearly, some supporters of sacred images claimed that it was possible to share the sacraments with the iconoclasts, but Theodore takes a harsher line.

84. This last paragraph contains a series of anathemas.

85. Lit. "it is not divided in the image"; yet another reference to Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149).

86. See Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 19 (PG 31: 509).

SECOND REFUTATION OF THE ICONOCLASTS

1. Again, the term *diairesis* indicates that, in doctrinal matters, "differences" can only lead to conflict and strife.

2. In this passage, *historia* seems to indicate images portraying specific episodes in the earthly life of Jesus, serving a propaedeutic purpose rather than mere representations of Christ.

3. Theodore seems to suggest that some iconoclasts did not oppose images openly but merely argued that icons had to be relegated to higher positions, thinking that in this way they could conceal the extent of their actual opposition to them. Theodore argues that this pretense of moderation does not fool anyone.

4. See 2 Kgs 18:3–4; 2 Kgs 23:4–20; 2 Chr 23:4–20. Theodore would have followed the usage that labeled the two books of Samuel, the two books of the Kings, and the two books of Chronicles as the six books of the Kings.

5. Lit. "which have their being out of the histories" (*onta ex historiōn*).

6. The structure is here the opposite of the one deployed in the *First Refutation*: there, the heretic makes a claim and the orthodox refutes it, here the orthodox poses questions to the heretic, who tries to answer, leading to further questions. The orthodox, of course, has the last word.

7. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Ep.* 101 (PG 37: 177).

8. The fact the *anthrōpos* and not *anēr* is used was also problematic, since one could see it as an assertion that Christ possessed human nature in general but not a specific gendered body; apparently, this was the position of the so-called *agraptodocetae*. See Thomas Cattoi, "Salvific Asymmetry: Anhypostasy and Icon Veneration in Theodore the Studite's *Antirrhetici*," in *Studia Patristica* 51 (2009): 181–94.

9. Athanasios of Alexandria, *Contra Apoll.* 2, 2 (PG 26: 1133).

10. Deut 6:13.

11. Theodore is thus conceding that the argument of the iconoclasts is correct, but only as far as the realm of *theologia*, and not in the realm of the divine dispensation.

12. The sense of the question appears to be that the passage distinguishes an object of *proskynēsis* and an object of *latreia*, so that the former would be given to the Son, and the latter to the Father. Interestingly, this would seem to suggest an element of Arianism in the iconoclastic view (*proskynēsis* being lower than *latreia*), and in the answer Theodore insists that Father and Son ought to be given the same level of worship.

13. John 1:18.

14. Heb 1:6. Migne's Latin version uses *adorare* rather loosely for both *latreuein* and *proskynein*.

15. Migne translates freely: "*una Deus permanens*," "simultaneously remaining God."

16. The term *homologia* refers here to the Nicene Creed, as "the same words" would be accepted by all the faithful.

17. See the same argument developed later in *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, II.

18. Theodore has his opponent resort to the teaching of anhypostasy ("he is not a mere man") as supporting the claim that Christ cannot be represented; this is the agraptodocetic position.

19. Alternatively, he has the characteristic (*logos*, in the sense of *logos spermatikos*) of being a prototype. There might be an echo of the claim of Maximos the Confessor that there are different sorts of *logoi* that preside over being, division, and judgment. See Maximos the Confessor, *Amb. 10* (PG 91: 1133A–37C).

20. Lit. "written" (*gegrammenou*); technically, one writes icons rather than drawing them. The use of the term *paragōgon* as "model" is unusual; the manuscript might have placed it here instead of *prōtotypos*.

21. Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 17. 3 (PG 31: 489).

22. The rare adjective *theēgoros* ("who speaks of divine matters") comes from the verb *theēgoreō*, from *theos* + *agoreuo*.

23. See Pseudo-Denys, *De Eccl. Hier.* 4, 3, 1 (PG 3: 473).

24. Namely, of the fact that this is the emperor's portrait.

25. Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 42, 4 (PG 31: 608); see also *Homily* 24 *Contra Sabellianos* (PG 31: 599–612).

26. Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Eunomium* 5 (PG 29: 724).

27. See Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* (PG 32: 149). Lit. "It is from you, and not from the Father (= Basil) that comes the metonymy (*hē metonymia*)."

28. Athanasios, *Contra Arios* 3, 5 (PG 26: 332).

29. Lit. "through the extension on it," *tē en autō ektasei*.

30. 1 Cor 2:8.

31. 1 Cor 1:24.

32. John 8:12; 9:5.

33. Phil 2:10; the original text refers to Christ in the third person.

34. John 11:25.

35. Athanasios, *Contra Arios* 3, 5 (PG 26: 332), as cited above.

36. Unusually, Cyril of Alexandria refers to *hē Graphē* to mean "the image," when the expression normally indicates Holy Scripture. Migne translates *hē Graphē* as *pictura*.

37. See Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesauros* (PG 75: 184–85).

38. Migne notes how a different codex says, "of the nature" (*tēs physeōs*).

39. The description that follows appears to be that of an iconostasis, with three major figures on top (Christ, the Mother of God, and John the Baptist), and a lower row of small icons representing the prophets and the apostles. The three figures might be a variation of the more common Deesis

theme (from *deēsis*, supplication), which includes John the Evangelist, rather than the Baptist. See Maria Cheremeteff, "The Transformation of the Russian Sanctuary Barrier and the Role of Theophanes the Greek," in *The Millennium. Christianity and Russia, A.D. 988–1988*, ed. Albert Leong (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990), 110–18.

40. The use of this term, instead of the more usual *Kyrios*, might suggest an image of Christ as *Pantokratoros*, or "ruler of the world."

41. See Matt 9:36, where Christ "was taken by pity (*splagchisthē*)" for the crowds.

42. See Sophronios of Jerusalem, *Ss Cyri et Joanni Miracula* (PG 87C: 3557–60). Sophronios was the spiritual teacher of Maximos the Confessor, and he is most likely the model for the elder in Maximos's *Liber Asceticus* (PG 91: 911–58). The story finds its way into the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea; see Erich Lamberz, *Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum. Concilium actiones I–III*, Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum 2, 3, 1 (Berlin, 2008).

43. Why Theodore should refer to angels at this point is not quite clear.

44. See Pseudo-Athanasios, *De Pass. Imaginis D. N. Jesu Christi* (PG 28: 814). The text is listed under "Spuria" by Migne and has only survived in the Latin version. The image in question is said to be in Berytum, in Syria, and the events are supposed to have taken place "during the reign of Constantine the Elder (Constantine V Copronymous) and Irene his spouse."

45. This time the term is not used to indicate the creed of Nicaea, as in par. VI above, but merely "a shared opinion."

46. A deliberate misapplication of a word for rhetorical purposes.

47. It is of course the intellect (*nous*), and not the senses, that ultimately has to discern the presence of the divine nature in the incarnate Christ.

48. They have an equal *dynamis*, or energy.

49. Again, Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149): this is the most frequently cited passage in the whole of the *Antirrhetici*. Basil seems to suggest that since the divine nature is undivided, there is only one type of deification, since we all participate in the same divine nature. At the same time, the saints do not lose their own individuality.

50. The objection of the iconoclast is not entirely unfounded, given that, in the passage in question, Basil does speak of Christ as the image of God the Father. In what follows, Theodore partially concedes this and notes that Basil's simile is used by him in a different way than Basil originally intended.

51. Lit. "...the honor of all under the hand" (*tōn hypo cheira pantōn*).

52. Wis 6:5–6.

53. The term is used by Neo-Platonic thinkers who address questions of linguistic or logic; see Plutarch, *Moralia*, 969.

54. See Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149). *Mymēsis* is here seen in opposition to *physis*.

55. Here, the term *prototype* is applied to a relationship, as will be the case again in the third *Antirrheticus*, Part B.

56. Apparently some iconoclasts would honor images of Christ and the saints as long as they were hung in high places—a stratagem that was supposed to diminish the risk of idolatry.

57. Rev 4:11.

58. Rev 5:12.

59. Rev 5:13.

60. John 5:23.

61. Isa 28:16.

62. Exod 20:12.

63. Eccl 3:3–4.

64. 1 Pet 2:17.

65. *Homostoichos* can also be translated as "belonging to the same order," "the same category"; both *homostoichos* and *homodynamos* are clearly calques of the Nicene term *homoousios*. See *Some Questions Posed by the [Same] Theodore to the Iconoclasts*, III.

66. The acclamation at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer in the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom.

67. Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149); Athanasios, *Contra Arios* 3, 5 (PG 26: 332).

68. See John Chrysostom, *Homilia enkōmiastikē eis ton en hagiois patera ēmōn Meletion archiepiskopon Antiocheias tēs megalēs kai eis tēn spoudēn tōn synelthontōn* ("Funeral Eulogy for Our Father in the Saints Meletios Archbishop of Antioch the Great, and for the Edification of Those Present") in PG 50: 516. The text is not accompanied by a Latin translation.

69. Meletios of Antioch (ca. 327–81) was a bishop of Antioch and a great opponent of the Arian heresy.

70. Heb 9:1–5.

71. Thereby referring to a part for the whole.

72. An exclamation from the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, proclaimed by the celebrant shortly before distributing communion to the congregation.

73. Theodore uses here the term *skiagraphia*, which is the type of classical vase painting whereby figures and scenes emerge out of a black background. The Old Testament injunctions are thereby likened to the darkness that surrounds the novelty of the New Testament and makes us see it for what it is.

74. The reference is to Heb 10:1, even if Paul seems to say that the law *is* a shadow, and therefore it is the law that is said to differ from the realities that followed it.

75. Theodore moves back and forth from using *nomos* as a synonym of the first five books of the Old Testament (hence the tent and the implements for sacrificial worship are said to be "in the law") to using it in its strict sense of law, in opposition to grace. Clearly, the conflation of the two legitimizes Theodore's allegorical reading.

76. The term *technologia* (which can be translated as "sophistry") is used by the Cappadocians to indicate a type of theological discourse that presumes to control the divine reality by means of its art (*technē*), as opposed to *theologia*. In the late fourth century, Gregory of Nyssa famously accused Eunomios of *technologia* and wrote an apologetic treatise to expose what he thought were the faulty viewpoints of his adversary; see Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* (PG 45: 239–1122).

77. *Koryphaiotatoi*: lit. "Those who are most *koryphai* of all." The *koryphai* is the term used in Classical Antiquity for those individuals who would open a procession; see Plato, *Theaetetus*, 173.

78. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 2, 93 (PG 35: 496). For the story of Eli, see 1 Sam 2:12–7; for Uzzah, 2 Sam 6:6–7; 1 Chr 13:9–10.

79. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 2, 94 (PG 35: 497).

80. The reference is unidentified.

81. Acts 17:23.

82. Lit. "He who inspires to piety."

83. Acts 25:21.

84. Acts 25:25.

85. By a sleight of hand, Theodore references scripture to argue that the Christian emperors of his time were worthy of veneration, even if, of course, the New Testament does not refer to Christian monarchs.

86. Again the Nestorian term *synapheia*, which Theodore had already used in *Antirrheticus* I, 12. See below *Some Questions Posed by the [Same] Theodore to the Iconoclasts*, 14.

87. The text seems to refer to truth as the fulfillment of the law, but the general sense of the passage seems to view law in opposition to truth and grace together.

88. The Greek text says, "*ton tou airontos...*," without ever specifying the noun to which the article *ton* refers. A possible implicit referent might be *charaktēr* ("shape," or "imprint").

89. Lit. "led by the hand."

90. This appears to be the only instance when we find the term *apolytrōsis* ("redemption") in Theodore's writings, and in fact we find it within a citation.

91. Canon 82, Quinisext Council. The same council also condemned the practice of representing God the Father as an old man, according to the Book of Daniel. Both canons were only haphazardly applied. See

Giandomenico Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, 11:977–80.

92. The text would then endorse the condemnation of the veneration of sculptures, which was always a rather rare phenomenon in Eastern Christianity. The reference is actually to Theodore of Jerusalem (745–67), whose synodical letter was read publicly during the Second Council of Nicaea. See Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, 12:1135–46.

93. See 2 Kgs 18:34. A medieval legend, however, continues to see Moses's original serpent in a bronze sculpture at the Basilica of Saint Ambrose in Milan, Italy.

94. See Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 45, 22 (PG 36: 653), which is a collage of 1 Cor 15:55 and Hos 13:14. In the *Patrologia Graeca*, the citation is made to end one sentence earlier, but this is already rectified in the Latin version.

95. The prototype of the bronze serpent is not Christ but the biting serpent, which is not worthy of veneration; hence, it is only fitting that the bronze serpent should be destroyed once it is no longer of use.

96. Cyril of Alexandria, in his treatise *De Adoratione et Cultu* (PG 68: 133–1126), develops an extensive allegorical interpretation of the Mosaic sacrificial laws. See also Cyril's *Glaphyrorum in Leviticum liber* (PG 69: 580A–89B).

97. Maximos the Confessor, *Acta* 18 (PG 90: 156). The passage refers to the end of the dispute that saw Maximos oppose Theodosios, bishop of Caesarea in Bithynia, on matters of christological doctrine. Eventually, Theodosios and his followers came to embrace Maximos's dythelite position.

98. The term *historia* appears to indicate a verbal description (see Plato, *Phaedrus*, 96), either written or oral, but in this context the term indicates a painted image.

99. 2 Cor 5:16.

100. Since in the Eucharist it becomes the channel of deification.

101. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 45 (PG 36: 640–41).

102. Luke 24:39.

103. As is made clear by the following citation from Basil, the iconoclasts are tempted to read all references to Christ's corporeality after the resurrection as mere metaphors for his ongoing activity in the created order, much as references to God's members in the Old Testament were not to be taken as literal descriptions of God's nature. The Greek text adds, rather redundantly, "Reality, which is asserted in theology, or in other words, in the explanation of the divine nature." The sense seems to be that, in the mystery of the incarnation, the divine nature inhabits a human body, and therefore any description of the divine nature must also include references to Christ's bodily members.

104. Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Eunomium* I, 5 (PG 29: 757). The point, of course, is that references to God's members in the old dispensation are to be understood differently from references to Christ's members after the incarnation.

105. *Puchytês*, which the Latin version in Migne translates as *crassitudo*, is a term that connects us to the era of the Origenist controversy. In Evagrios's *Kephalaia Gnostika*, the noetic realities, which came into being at the beginning of time, acquired "thickness" when they turned away from God and descended into the realm of plurality; the goal of spiritual practice, of course, is to return to a pure noetic state. See, for instance, Antoine Guillaumont, trans., *Les Six Centuries des 'Kephalaia Gnostika' d'Évagre le Pontique* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1958), Book I, 1–45, where Evagrios compares different kinds of "spiritual" and "carnal" bodies and modes of perception.

106. The use of the perfect indicates that the effect of the action lasts in time ("*et effectus durat*"). In his reflections on the transfiguration, Maximos the Confessor similarly noted that the disciples who accompanied Jesus on Mount Tabor had to "purify their spiritual and bodily senses," so that they could "apprehend the spiritual *logoi* of the mysteries that are disclosed to them"; see *Amb.* 10 (PG 91: 1125D–26D). Arguably, the other disciples had not gone through this process of purification, and as a result they would not have been able to "see" the transfiguration, even if they had been physically present at the event.

107. John 20:29.

108. Toward the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, Symeon the New Theologian opposed the claim that it was no longer possible to have the kind of spiritual experiences that were available to the disciples of Christ and the early Christian communities. See Basil Krivocheine, *In the Light of Christ: Saint Symeon, the New Theologian (949–1022), Life, Spirituality, Doctrine* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986).

109. Pseudo-Denys, *De Div. Nom.* 2, 9 (PG 3: 648).

110. This passage seems to suggest an ontological change in the humanity of Christ after the resurrection, which seems to contradict the Chalcedonian assertion that Christ's natures are united "in an unchangeable manner (*atreptôs*)" even in the presence of the *communicatio idiomatum*. See Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 170–71.

111. 2 Cor 5:16.

112. 1 Cor 10:16.

113. In line with Maximos the Confessor's critique of Origenism, Theodore is adamant that the goal of spiritual practice is not dissolution in an undifferentiated noetic unity with the Divine; rather, the experience of deification preserves and ratifies our individual subjectivity, which continues to grow in a relationship with God. See, for instance, Maximos the Confessor, *Amb.* 7 (PG 91: 1088C); *Mystagogia* 2, 4 (PG 91: 667–71, 684). Theodore argues that if Christ were uncircumscribed after the resurrection, we would lose our own individual identity.

114. 1 Tim 2:5.

115. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 30, 14 (PG 36: 121).

116. Ibid., *Ep.* 101 (PG 37: 177).

117. Ibid. (PG 37: 181).

118. Theodore is referencing a number of texts that attacked the veneration of the images and that were attributed to Epiphanios of Salamis (310–403), the author of the *Ancoratus* and the *Panarion*. As we can see, the authorship of these texts—which were a collection of occasional writings rather than a single, coherent treatise—was already controversial at the time of Theodore; see Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 2:102–3. More recently, in his *Epiphanios of Salamis, Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth* (Rollinsford, NH: Orthodox Research Institute, 2008), Orthodox scholar Stephen Bigham argues convincingly against the traditional attribution of these texts to Epiphanios.

119. As with other citations that Theodore attributes to Basil of Caesarea, the text referenced here is unknown.

120. Theodore may be referring to a passage in John Chrysostom, *Hom in Cor.* 2 (PG 61: 18–22), but the exact reference is uncertain.

121. Gal 1:8–9.

122. Valentinos (ca. 100–160) apparently taught that Christ's body was of the same material as the stars and the planets; see Ismo O. Dunderberg, *Beyond Gnosticism: Myth, Lifestyle, and Society in the School of Valentinus* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 119–34. While most accounts of the life of Mani (ca. 216–76) are largely legendary, the founder of Manicheism appears to have taught that the incarnate Christ was a manifestation of the eternal preexistent divine Light; see Marella Franzmann, *Jesus in the Manichean Writings* (London: T & T Clark, 2003), 15–51.

Third Refutation of the Iconoclasts

1. 1 Sam 17, Ps 23. Theodore was most likely familiar with Psalm 151 in the Septuagint, where David speaks in the first person and describes his struggle with Goliath.

2. This might indicate that the third *Antirrheticus* was composed sometime after the first two were already in circulation.

3. Accusations of *technologia* ("sophistry") were traditionally leveled to holders of unorthodox positions, echoing the Cappadocians' critique of Eunomios (335–ca. 339) in the late fourth century; see Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* (PG 45: 239–1122); see also Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter*

with Hellenism (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), chap. 4 ("God and the Ways of Knowing"), 57–74.

4. Lit. "into what is clearly arranged," from *eu* ("well") and *krinō* ("to judge," "to apportion").

5. *Emphereia* indicates that the image "takes (*pherei*)" the viewer "into (*en*)" the reality to which it refers.

6. Theodore is here retrieving the classical discussion on the "common intellect" (*koinos nous*) or "natural reason" (*physikē ennoia*) that are shared by all members of the human race; see, for instance, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* I, 19 (PG 8: 805–14) or Gregory of Nyssa, *De Anima et Res* (PG 46: 11–160).

7. Isa 6:1.

8. Ezek 1:18.

9. Individuals come to know the human nature of Christ through the properties of his humanity and his divine nature through the properties of his divinity. In this passage, Theodore uses *physis* to indicate Christ's humanity and divinity, while *ousia* is reserved for the essence of the nature, which is then accompanied by a specific set of properties (*idiōmata*). Other authors use *ousia* to indicate the nature in its totality; see, for instance, Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 214, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 8, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991).

10. As noted earlier, *diaphora* indicates a positive kind of difference.

11. Prov 8:22.

12. Prov 8:25.

13. To suggest that Christ is created (*ktistos*) would of course be a return to the Arian heresy; see Athanasios, *Contra Arius* 3, 5 (PG 26: 332).

14. *Deductio ad absurdum*, rather than *reductio ad absurdum*, seems to suggest that the absurd conclusion is reached by way of association rather than by way of direct inference.

15. Phil 2:7.

16. A possible reference to Isa 53:3 in the Septuagint translation.

17. 1 Cor 11:24.

18. John 1:18.

19. John 9:37.

20. In other words, while Christ does not have a human hypostasis, he is still in need of a center of subjectivity, as no nature can exist unless it is individuated in a particular hypostasis. Conversely, the fact that Christ's humanity has specific individuating characteristics does not indicate that Christ has a human hypostasis, since his divine hypostasis plays the role of center of subjectivity that would be ordinarily served by the human hypostasis.

21. See again Leontios of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* (PG 86A: 1277CD); the same argument had been deployed in *Antirrheticus* I,

4. Theodore rhetorically connects the position of the iconoclasts with the Manicheans' portrayal of Christ as a celestial light; see also *Antirrheticus* 2, 48.

22. According to Evagrios, *nous* is the intuition beyond the realm of concepts, whereas *dianoia* is deductive reasoning that is tied to the world of form. See *Antirrheticus* 1, 5.

23. In *153 Texts on Prayer*, 57, 66, 68, Evagrios had enjoined his followers to flee from contemplation of earthly matters and to approach the immaterial in a purely immaterial manner, as the Deity did not possess either quantity or form; see Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, in *Philokalia*, 1:62–63. That kind of disembodied spirituality would have been comfortable with the notion that Christ's general humanity could only be contemplated by the mind. While Theodore does not address Evagrios directly, he would have classified Evagrios among those for whom Christ could at most have been incarnate in the imagination (*phantasma*) since the Logos could not possibly have been tainted by matter. Since Christ instead became incarnate in a particular individual, Christ can be not only contemplated by the mind, but he can also be seen and touched in the flesh.

24. John 20:29.

25. John 20:27.

26. Luke 1:31.

27. This passage may have been influenced by the discussion of "proper names" and "common names" in Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium: Cur Non Sint Tres Dei* (GNO III: 1, 42; NPNF 2.5, 331). Gregory's discussion, however, hinges on the distinction among the three Persons of the Trinity.

28. Matt 16:13.

29. John 18:4–5.

30. Matt 17:26–7.

31. While Nestorios stopped short of positing two full-fledged persons in Christ, he and Cyril emphasized the duality of natures and subjectivities in the incarnate Christ; hence Cyril's apologetic treatise in defense of Christ's unity. For a comprehensive account of the dispute between Cyril and Nestorios, see John McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004).

32. See Leontios of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos* (PG 86A: 1297B, 1300AB).

33. The term *Akephaloi* was initially associated with certain fifth-century Monophysite groups; St. Nicodemos the Hagiorite writes in the preface to the Canons of the Fourth Council (held at Ephesus in 431) that "all Monophysites were called *akephaloi*, an allusion to the fact that they were cut off from the Patriarchate of Alexandria…and showed allegiance to no single head, but some to one, and some to yet another." See Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 2:27. Named after Apollinaris of Laodicea, Apollinarism taught instead that Christ had a human body and a lower soul—the seat of the emotions—but the role of the intellect was played by the eternal Word of God; hence, Christ lacked a real human soul, or in other words, he had a composite nature. See Ekkehard Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969), 18–32. While the two belief systems were quite different, they agreed in their rejection of Christ's consubstantiality with the Father and with humanity as taught by the Council of Chalcedon.

34. While Montanism was far from having a coherent set of beliefs, most members of this movement appeared to espouse some form of incarnational Docetism; see the study of David I. Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

35. John 6:52.

36. Deut 4:12.

37. Again, Isa 53:3 from the Septuagint.

38. Isa 53:3.

39. This term could also mean "exact image," but this does not seem to be the case here.

40. Isa 50:6.

41. Ps 22:16–17.

42. The Latin version translates *epigraphē* as "circumscription," but this should rather be *perigraphē*.

43. Phil 2:7; Matt 2:23; John 1:14.

44. John 1:29.

45. A typical strategy of the objections is to misinterpret the *communicatio idiomatum*, and to unwittingly—or perhaps deliberately, as part of a broader rhetorical strategy—ascribe the properties of one nature to the other, rather than to ascribe both sets of properties to the hypostasis that indwells both natures. The resulting logical inconsistencies are then used to excoriate the alleged absurdity of the orthodox position.

46. The Theopaschites (or Patripassians) argued that as the Father and the Son share the same divine nature, God the Father shared in the sufferings of Christ on the cross. From a Chalcedonian perspective, they failed to understand that the divine Person of the Logos suffered on the cross in virtue of the *communicatio idiomatum* with his humanity. For an excellent overview of the Theopaschite arguments, see David R. Maxwell, "Christology and Grace in the Sixth-Century Latin West: The Theopaschite Controversy," PhD diss. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2003).

47. Some iconoclasts suggested that images of Christ could only portray his humanity and not his divinity; in this perspective, since an icon effectively "divided" Christ into two, the veneration of the images amounted to a surreptitious form of Nestorianism. See Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 116–20.

48. The last few words are puzzling, as they might appear to suggest that Christ is uncircumscribed even with respect to the humanity, which

would contradict what Theodore has repeatedly claimed up to this point. The meaning is probably that it is not the human nature as such that determines circumscribability, but rather the properties of the human nature that are individuated in the hypostasis.

49. John 14:9.

50. This would suggest that Christ has a human hypostasis, which Theodore, of course, cannot accept. See above, *Antirrheticus* 3, 16–17.

51. Again, this stresses that in the *communicatio idiomatum*, the properties of either nature are not ascribed to the other nature, but to the hypostasis of the Word.

52. Maximos the Confessor would note that the hypostasis of Christ is composite (*synthetos*), as it comes from two natures (*ek dyo physeōn*). See Maximos the Confessor, *Ep.* 12 (PG 91: 224A; 469D; 484A).

53. Isa 8:3; the prophetess is a type of the Virgin Mary, who prophesied as she recited the Magnificat (Luke 1:46–55).

54. Luke 2:21.

55. Theodore's understanding of angels as corporeal and therefore circumscribable differs radically from the later Western tradition, which came to envisage angels as pure spirits endowed with the gift of ubiquity. For Theodore, God alone can be regarded as pure spirit, as anything lower than the Divine is already entangled in the world of matter. In addition, if Theodore had espoused the angelology developed by Thomas Aquinas in the *Summa*'s "Treaty on Angels" (*ST* I, 50–64), he would not have been able to talk of "the nature of the angels," as according to Aquinas, each angel is endowed with its own nature and exhausts its own genus; see *ST* I, Q 54, Art. 1–2.

56. 1 Cor 15:40. Origen, for instance, would have read this passage as an indication that stars and planets were the "bodies" of particularly advanced spirits; see Alan Scott, *Origen and the Life of the Stars: A History of an Idea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), esp. 14–56.

57. See, however, Matt 18:10, where Jesus warns his disciples not to despise little children, as "their angels in heaven always see the face of my Father." The passage could imply that guardian angels are simultaneously in heaven and on earth with their wards, but Theodore was clearly of a different opinion.

58. Phil 2:6–7.

59. John 8:58.

60. The note "as it were" (*hoper*) is added before *eis enōtēn physikēn*, since the notion of a natural union, as opposed to a hypostatic union, might be taken to suggest a blurring of the boundaries of the two natures. Any such blurring, and the resulting creation of a *tertium quid*, would be incompatible with the teaching of Chalcedon.

61. Deut 4:12.

62. See Evagrios, *153 Texts on Prayer*, 67, in *Philokalia*, 1:63. Theodore's

point is that this claim is true when applied to the divine nature as such, but in the new dispensation, it is no longer accurate when we talk of the incarnate Christ.

63. Luke 9:29.

64. Rom 1:23–25.

65. Rom 1:21–22.

66. 1 Tim 1:7.

67. In Migne's Greek text, the latter part of the sentence is included in the citation, which appears to be a mistake.

68. Phil 2:6–8.

69. Rom 1:23.

70. Rom 1:25.

71. This echoes 1 Cor 12:27.

72. The distinction between *logos* and *tropos* is a crucial theme in the theology of Maximos the Confessor, who distinguishes between a blueprint that grounds the nature of different aspects of realities (so that different aspects of realities have different *logoi*) and a dynamic principle, or energy, that determines how this nature plays out in time. See Maximos the Confessor, *Q.Th.* 22 (CCSG 7: 139).

73. Christ's divinity is consubstantial to the divinity of the Father, and Christ's humanity is consubstantial to our humanity, but the two natures are not consubstantial with each other.

74. Theodore claims that every created, circumscribable reality has, at least potentially, an artificial image, in the sense that such an image could be produced. If the Virgin Mary is circumscribable, she has the potentiality of being reproduced in an artificial image. Since Christ is consubstantial with (i.e., is a natural image of) his mother according to his humanity, he must also share with her the property of potentially having an artificial image, otherwise he would not be consubstantial with her.

75. This can also indicate a seal that is imprinted in wax.

76. Matt 22:20.

77. Matt 22:21.

78. The use of the past perfect entails that Christ assumed a human nature and he still has it.

79. Compare this discussion with the more convoluted—and somewhat unconvincing—argument in *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts*, 2.

80. Origen, for his part, had called Christ *autobasileia*, the very manifestation of the kingdom of God; see, for instance, Origen, *Hom.* in Lucam 32 (PG 13: 1882–84).

81. Gen 1:26.

82. Heb 5:7.

83. The verb *diorizō* also indicates separation and distinction.

84. It appears that Theodore is here using the term *homoiōsis* ("likeness") to indicate the hypostasis.

85. An approximate citation from Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149).

86. The implication is that the decision to venerate an image "by position" (*thesei*) is arbitrary, so that in theory one could make the same decision about all sorts of other material objects, and the result would be idolatry.

87. This is actually a citation from Isa 42:8, which continues, "I will not share my praise with carved idols." Theodore extrapolates the passage from its original context and makes Christ the subject of the speech.

88. John 14:6.

89. See *Antirrhetica* 3C, 11.

90. Presumably, when he observes that no interval of time intervenes between the prototype and the image, Theodore also means that the risen Christ whom we worship exists at the same time as the images that we venerate.

91. *Charaktēr* is used, rather unusually, to indicate the trinitarian hypostasis.

92. This argument, which is repeated in slightly different form in the following two paragraphs, appears to be rather weak. One could object that many members of the human race throughout history were never represented iconographically and, yet, did not cease to be human beings. Theodore seems to suggest that the production of an image is a prerequisite for Christ's continuing to be human, which is clearly not the case. What Theodore may want to say is that, without the production of sacred images, the humanity of Christ would cease to be soteriologically effective, as no one who is on earth today can see Christ's human form.

93. 2 Cor 5:7.

94. 2 Cor 5:7–8.

95. 1 Cor 13:12–13.

96. Gal 3:1. Paul was not referring to an actual image but to the fact that the mystery of Christ crucified had been preached to the Galatians in a vivid manner.

97. Or "circumscription"; *perigraphē* may be both, and the ambiguity is probably deliberate.

98. A brief prayer by a copyist, which Migne has preserved as a conclusion to the *Antirrhetics*.

Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts

1. Rom 1:23.

2. Ibid.

3. Num 21:7–10; Exod 25:18.

4. Exod 25:40.

5. Acts 17:29.

6. 1 Cor 8:6.

7. Phil 2:6.

8. Acts 2:31–35.

9. The term *emphereia* seems to indicate that the image "takes" (*pherei*) the viewer "into" (*en*) the prototype.

10. A possible reference could be the usual passage in Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 44–45 (PG 32: 147–51), although similar passages can be found throughout the writings of this Cappadocian father.

11. In the sense that the hypostasis of the eternal Word is also the hypostasis of the icon, which, like the humanity of Christ, does not have a hypostasis of its own.

12. Pseudo-Denys, *De Eccl. Hier.* 4, 3, 1 (PG 3: 473).

13. This refers to the rite of prosthesis, proskomedia (the preparation of the gifts) before the Byzantine liturgy, when a small liturgical knife is used to cut from a larger loaf the bread that will be used for the Eucharist; this passage indicates that by the early tenth century, this ritual had already taken the form that it still has today. A reflection on the prosthesis image can be found in Klaus Gamber, *Zeige Uns, O Herr, deine Barmherzigkeit: vom byzantinischen Prothesis-Bild zum spätmittelalterlichen Erbärmde-Christus* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1986).

14. Matt 14:28–32.

15. Matt 17:23.

16. Matt 22:18.

17. Ps 148:5. The logic of this section, however, is far from invulnerable. To the objection that the Gospels never mention the image of Christ, Theodore refers us to the episode of Christ paying the tribute to the emperor, as every Roman coin bore the image of the emperor, and Christ and Peter paid their tribute with these coins, the images on the coins become "the images" of Christ and Peter. Finally, as if Theodore sensed that his argument does not really follow, he adds that most likely Christ himself "shaped" the image on the coin by creating the *statera* in the entrails of the fish. The fundamental problem with this example is that the image on the coin is an image of the emperor, not an image of Christ. As such, it is unlikely that the iconoclasts would find this passage convincing.

18. This mention of a cross in the skies, which a few lines below we are told is worthy of veneration, may be a reference to the cross in the constellation of Cygnus, which Ptolemy had already described around the year AD 130 in his treatise *Almagest*.

19. Rom 5:12–21.

20. The notion that the cross unifies "the things of heaven" and "the

things of earth" is a *tropos* in the writings by Maximos the Confessor; see *Amb.* 41 (PG 91: 1304D–16A).

21. Deut 4:19.

22. Theodore is saying that the image of the cross in the stars only became worthy of veneration after the passion of Christ, though after this event, images of the cross on which Christ suffered started to appear everywhere on earth. The iconoclasts' rejection of the cross is linked with the Jewish rejection of the incarnation of Christ.

23. 1 Tim 2:5.

24. Theodore does not seem to consider the possibility that in a paraliturgical context, a priest might bless the faithful with an icon of Christ.

25. Rom 8:29.

26. 2 Cor 11:7.

27. 1 Pet 2:9.

28. In Migne, these words are missing in the Greek text and added in the Latin text. The Greek text is probably corrupt.

29. The implication seems to be that images of Christ, alone of all images made by human hands, carry a special ontological link with their prototype that makes them channels of salvific grace.

30. Gal 2:19.

31. Matt 6:24.

32. See, for instance, Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 38, 7 (PG 36: 317–18), though the same claim can be found elsewhere in Gregory's work. In his sermon on the nativity of Christ, Gregory juxtaposes the mystery of God's transcendence and God's extraordinary condescension in the event of the incarnation.

33. Φώς is a poetic term occasionally used as a synonym of *anēr* (a male individual). A classical precedent is Sophocles, *Electra*, 1224, 1354.

34. Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ*, 7, 79. Cyril's use of *physis* to indicate Christ's principle of subjectivity, as well as his two natures, led to a series of misunderstandings whose consequences are still with us today. See Hans van Loon, *The Diophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); for an analysis from a traditional Eastern Orthodox perspective, see John S. Romanides, "St. Cyril's 'one *physis* (or hypostasi)s of God, the Logos Incarnate' and Chalcedon," in *Does Chalcedon Divide or Unite?* ed. P. Gregorios, W. H. Lazereth, and N. Nissiotis (Geneva: World of Council of Churches, 1981), 50–75.

35. Gregory of Nazianzos, *Or.* 38, 17 (PG 36: 327–30).

36. This is actually a reference to the Quinisext Council of 692, which banned the representation of Christ in the shape of the lamb, but simultaneously asserted the legitimacy of icon veneration. See John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 1987), 177–78.

37. See Athanasios, *Or. Contra Arios* 2, 9 (PG 26: 163–66).

38. *Diaphora* is a positive kind of difference, as opposed to *diairesis*, which presupposes conflict; for this reason we are told that in the hypostatic union, the humanity and the divinity of Christ exist in an *adiairetōs* manner. See Thomas Cattoi, "The Symphonic Church: Chalcedonian Themes in Maximos the Confessor's Liturgical Theology," in *Studia Patristica* 48 (2007): 123–29.

Some Questions Posed to the Iconoclasts

1. Throughout this brief work, Theodore resorts to the strategy of *reductio ad absurdum*. With biting irony, he outlines the objection raised by the iconoclasts and exposes the absurdity of the consequences of their assertions.

2. This is a reference, or at least an echo, of the teaching of the composite nature of Christ's hypostasis that was discussed in the introduction. See Maximos the Confessor, *Ep.*12 (PG 91: 224A; also 469D, 484A; 489BC).

3. Given that Chalcedonian Christology cannot countenance the emergence of a third "Christic" nature that is only proper to the incarnate Word.

4. In other words, it would be incompatible with the divine *physis*.

5. Another possible translation is "of the same element" and "of a different element." The term *stoicheion* is commonly used in Neo-Platonic thought and ultimately comes from the discussion of the four elements in the R. G. Bury translation of *Timeus* 32 bd (Loeb Classical Library, 1929).

6. In other words, it is possible to say that the eternal Logos is circumscribed according to the flesh but certainly not according to the divine nature that is omnipresent throughout the cosmos. If what is uncircumscribable were of the same order as what is circumscribable, one would have to say that the human nature of Christ is omnipresent and ungraspable and that his divine nature is fully contained and circumscribed in his incarnate body—both of which are logically untenable positions. To express the same concept using the Cyrillian notion of the *communicatio idiomatum*, the hypostasis of the incarnate Logos is both circumscribable and uncircumscribable because it exists in two natures (or out of two natures!); the humanity of the incarnate Logos is circumscribable in the flesh in the incarnate Christ; and the divinity of the incarnate Logos is uncircumscribable and omnipresent throughout the cosmos.

7. *Heterotēs* refers to the distinction between the humanity and the divinity, which is acceptable; *allotriotēs* refers to the difference that would ensue between a nature and its properties if the humanity of Christ were uncircumscribable, which is not acceptable.

8. He can be portrayed according to the humanity, and cannot be portrayed according to the divinity.

9. John 20:25. It is interesting that the chosen citation should refer to a post-resurrection appearance.

10. Paul of Samosata (200–275) famously taught a form of trinitarian monarchianism where Christ "received" the Logos at his baptism; See Patricio de Navascués, *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios: estudio histórico-teológico del cristianismo antioqueno en el siglo tercero* (Rome: Institutum patristicum Agostinianum, 2004), 422–58. For Mani, see *Antirrheticus* 2, 48.

11. Lit. "consider this dual abyss" (*amphykrēmnon*).

12. The implication for the veneration of the icons is that Christ is known to us by way of his humanity, which places him within the purview of our senses, and as such he can be portrayed in an image.

13. This is a classic example that one can trace to Heraclitus's discussion of the unity of opposites; see Philip E. Wheelwright, *Heraclitus* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959), 12–49.

14. Severus of Antioch (465–ca. 540) was a non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch whose name would eventually become a byword for opposition to the Christology of Chalcedon; a strict follower of Cyril of Alexandria, he thought it was more appropriate to talk of only one "nature" (*physis*) of the incarnate Christ, which would then be manifest through the properties of the eternal Logos and of the incarnate humanity of Christ. For Theodore, this form of monophysitism is logically untenable, as it erases the ontological incompatibility of the properties of the two natures (hence the claim that Severus asserted the existence of "aqueous fire"). See Roberta C. Bondi, *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 18–66.

15. This expression is typical of Maximos the Confessor, who distinguishes the structure of the nature (*ho tēs physeōs logos*) from the manner of its usage (*ho tropos tēs hyparxeōs*). See Maximos the Confessor, *Q.Th* 22 (CCSG 7: 139).

16. Again, the term *prōsopon* is used as opposed to *hypostasis*.

17. Epiphanios of Salamis, *Ancoratus* 32 (PG 43: 73). The *Ancoratus*—the earliest work by Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis (320–403)—addresses a series of heresies that threatened the Christian faith as it had been formulated at the Council of Nicaea.

18. The *Synodical Letter* by Sophronios of Jerusalem (560–638) chastises the heresy of monoergetism, which Sophronios regarded as dangerously veering toward monophysitism, and therefore as intrinsically incompatible with the Chalcedonian paradigm. See Pauline Allen, ed., *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and Other Documents* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 85–119.

19. For the classical discussion of Nestorius's understanding of the incarnation, see Cyril of Alexandria, *De Unitate Christi* (PG 75: 1254–1363); see also, in the translation by John McGuckin, Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Unity of Christ* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995), esp. 49–55.

20. It is interesting that Theodore should use *synapheia* in an "orthodox" sense just a few lines after critiquing Nestorios's "two-Sons" Christology. See *Antirrheticus* 1, 12; 2, 38.

Letter to His Own Father Plato

1. Pseudo-Denys, *De Eccl. Hier.* 4, 3, 1 (PG 3: 473).

2. Basil of Ceasarea, *Homily* 42, 4 (PG 31: 608); see also Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesaurus* (PG 75: 184–85).

3. Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45 (PG 32: 149).

4. Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Eunomium* 5 (PG 29: 724), though the argument is repeated in various places wherever Basil addresses the question of the veneration of images; see also his *Homily* 42, 3–4 (PG 31: 604–8).

5. The Greek participle *epereidomenon* is neuter; one would expect *epereidomenē* to fit the noun *proskynēsis* ("veneration"), and the Latin version in Migne translates accordingly. The Greek text is probably corrupt.

6. The veneration (*proskynēsis*) of the images of the Virgin Mary and of the saints should be seen as instrumental and subordinate to the adoration (*latreia*) that is due to the Trinity alone.

Refutation and Subversion of the Impious Poems

1. This work is divided into two parts: paragraphs 1–16 include a number of poems by iconoclastic authors, followed by some poems by Theodore in support of sacred images and by a more detailed refutation of some of the iconoclastic compositions; paragraphs 17–35 contain a detailed discussion of an iconoclastic profession of faith, which Theodore concludes with an alternative, "orthodox" profession. The authors of the iconoclastic poems—John, Ignatios, Sergios, and Stephanos—cannot be identified with any certainty, although John might be John the Grammarian (780–867), who was patriarch of Constantinople between 837 and 843.

2. For each of these poems, the first letter of each line, the middle letter of each line, the middle word of the middle line (highlighted in the translation), and the last letter of each line constitute a sentence that Theodore poses as an acrostic at the top of the poem.

3. The stanza appears to refer to the New Testament authors who narrate the life of Christ in line with the teaching of Old Testament prophets and

never refer to "lowly matters" such as Christ's physical aspect. The aspect of any actual description of Christ is, then, interpreted as an echo of the Old Testament injunction against images. The error of the painters of images is said to be "recurrent" (*palindromon*), as it had already been condemned in the Old Testament, and it continues to resurface.

4. *Krisis* may refer to a specific edict or legal pronouncement, or more broadly to a general good judgment on the part of the emperors. The implication is that, while the veneration of icons is idolatrous, the veneration of the cross, which is sponsored by the emperors, is praiseworthy and acceptable to God.

5. A possible interpretation that would be in line with the overall preoccupation of the text with the dialectic of prototype and image would point to the story in Num 21:6–9, when Moses raised a bronze serpent (a type of the cross) to save the Israelites from the bite of poisonous snakes. However, as the bronze serpent was itself an image, an iconoclast would not want to draw attention to an episode that could be regarded as setting a precedent for the veneration of images. In paragraph VII, Theodore interprets this stanza as a reference to the story in Exod 17:8–16, when Moses prays with his hands extended in the shape of a cross so that the Hebrews can defeat the Amalekites in battle. In the iconoclastic perspective of the author of this stanza, the cross is the weapon that will defend the faithful from the threat posed by the images.

6. From an iconoclastic perspective, images are like poisoned arrows.

7. This verse does not follow the acrostic system, which resumes in the response by "the Orthodox." The bronze door refers to the doors of the imperial palace in Constantinople.

8. Given the possible date of this poem, this passage could refer to Leo VI (866–912) and to his son from his fourth controversial marriage, Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (905–59). It is more likely, however, that the iconoclast author should refer to Leo III the Isaurian (685–741) and to his son Constantine V Copronymous (718–75). Constantine V was the convener of the Council of Hiera that in 754 condemned the veneration of the images and inaugurated the first iconoclastic crisis; see John Julius Norwich, *Byzantium: The Early Centuries* (New York: Random House, 1988), chap. 17, 345–66. The iconoclastic author presents these two emperors as supporting the veneration of the cross in opposition to the veneration of sacred images.

9. *Syllabē* (from *syn* + *lambanō*, "to hold together") seems to indicate the acrostic that uses the first as well as the last letter of each line, so that it contains the verse like a pincer. This explicatory superscript is contained in the Greek text by Migne.

10. Lit. *grapton*, "written" or "described."

11. Migne renders the Greek term *ainos* as "gloria."

12. Christ is the creator of the angelic hosts, hence, he can be characterized as their cause (*aitia*).

13. The passage may refer to a specific iconoclastic author, or to anyone who uses reason to condemn the veneration of sacred images, and therefore engages in a futile attempt to oppose God's plan for the world.

14. Theodore is comparing his own writings to "a dew" that irrigates the minds and the souls of the faithful so as to bring them closer to Christ.

15. The next thirteen lines of the refutation by "the Orthodox" do not follow the rigid pattern of the previous acrostics, but they continue the same argument in free verse until a simplified acrostic structure resumes below.

16. "It" clearly refers to the doctrine of dual consubstantiality.

17. The remaining acrostics in this section use only the first letter and the last letter of each line; hence, no word is highlighted in the body of the poem.

18. The passage is obscure. As noted by a footnote in Migne, "*romphala*," meaning a double-edged sword, appears to be a reference to the fact that some primitive icons carried the image of Christ on one side and the symbol of the cross on the other. Theodore would then suggest that on the back of the image of Christ there is a cross, which Christ uses like a sword to defeat death and the devil.

19. This is a usual reference to *kenōsis* in Phil 2:5–8, even if the actual term is not used, most likely for metric reasons.

20. A less literal translation could be "a poetic outburst."

21. The acrostic structure ceases again.

22. Four stanzas above, it was the cross that Christ used as a weapon to defeat evil, whereas here it is the human image, or shape, which receives the divine power by way of the communication of the idioms.

23. This might be a term indicating Christ's sovereignty over the universe, albeit *skēptros* might actually refer to the cross, which is an instrument of victory.

24. What follows is a refutation-commentary to the poems of the iconoclasts, which are analyzed verse by verse.

25. 1 John 1:1.

26. John 4:6; John 6:19; John 2:12; Matt 5:1.

27. Theodore notes that the evangelists wrote what they themselves had seen; as such, they did not merely follow the teaching of the Old Testament prophets, who had not been direct witnesses of Christ's earthly ministry. At the same time, the fact that in the Gospels the evangelists describe scenes from the life of Christ does not mean that they consider them "lowly matters" that detract from the divine majesty. As such, the claim by the iconoclasts is doubly false.

28. The text in Migne omits one line from the original poem ("the speech of both divine authors and prophets rests on nothing but hope in God") and continues to include the line "And those who agree with these teachings, the emperors who carry crowns . . ." which is repeated below.

29. Jer 2:12.
30. Ps 117:2.
31. 2 Thess 2:3–4.
32. The suggestion is that iconoclasts, by preaching contempt for the images of Christ, are paving the way to the Antichrist, who will preach contempt for Christ himself.
33. Most likely the iconoclast Council of Hieria (754); see Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 180–83.
34. The Second Council of Nicaea had reestablished the veneration of icons in 787, but iconoclasm had broken out again in Theodore's time.
35. Lit. "he is talking from the earth" (*ek tēs gēs*), he is not following a divine inspiration.
36. This is a reference to Gregory of Nazianzos's famous saying that "whatever is not assumed is not healed." See Gregory of Nazianzos, *Ep. Ad Cledonium*, in *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*, ed. F. J. Williams and L. R. Wickham (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), 155–66.
37. See note to *Antirrheticus* 2, 48.
38. It is not clear to which of Basil's texts Theodore may be referring.
39. Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 18, 45 (PG 32: 149).
40. John 12:47. "Today" should be read as a rhetorical reference to the never-ending day of the new dispensation.
41. Christ is substantially present in the Eucharist but is not substantially present in the cross.
42. An expression of irony.
43. Isa 8:1.
44. Theodore is playing with the double meaning of *graphō*, which indicates writing as well as painting.
45. Aristotle, in his *Posterior Analytics*, 7–10, discusses the role of different kinds of definitions and mentions the deer-stag as an example of an untenable concept.
46. We could also translate as "whatever is perceptible can be painted." Throughout the whole passage, the verb *graphō* and its cognates are used with the dual meaning of circumscribing and painting.
47. If Christ was displeased with what he has done, he would not want his life and his passion to be told and to be the subject of sacred images, but this is clearly not the case.
48. Ignatios, the author of the iconoclastic poem that is the subject of Theodore's comments, is lumped together with heretics such as Marcion, Manes, and Valentinos. Marcion of Sinope (85–160), under the influence of Gnosticism, understood the incarnation in a docetic manner, and thought that Christ's body was a mere appearance; see Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*, trans. John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma (Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2007), 24–49. For Valentinos and Manes, see note to *Antirrheticus* 2, 48.
49. Exod 17:8–16.
50. Col 2:15.
51. In this rather convoluted passage, Theodore acknowledges that Sergios interpreted the actions of Moses in Exod 17:8–16 as a prefiguration of the cross of Christ, but goes on to accuse him of being inconsistent, since he will honor the cross but not Christ, who was crucified on it. Indeed, Theodore claims, since the word *Christ* is used for both the image and the prototype, Sergios would go as far as wanting to take the real Christ down from the cross.
52. Matt 12:26: "If Satan drives out Satan, he is divided against himself. How then can his kingdom stand?" The implication is that the iconoclasts do to Christ what in the Gospels is said of Satan, which is utter blasphemy.
53. The implication is that iconoclasts would deprive the people even of this means to come to know of the incarnation; they would rather leave humanity in the darkness of error.
54. Theodore implies that anyone who has seen an image of Christ and has started to consider it with faith will not only not come to harm, but will actually learn to discern the true poison of heresy.
55. Isa 1:2–3.
56. 1 Cor 12:3.
57. Matt 12:31–32. The rhetorical purpose behind this citation is to associate iconoclasm with the only sin Christ himself calls "unforgivable."
58. 1 Cor 10:19.
59. Lit. "sight (*opsis*) comes together with the contemplation (*theōria*) of the intellect (*nous*)." Theodore knows fully well that icons do not portray the events of Christ's life as they really happened, but this discrepancy does not jeopardize the propaedeutic and salvific impact of contemplating the sacred images.
60. Exod 25:17–22.
61. A paraphrase, rather than an exact repetition, of the last line of the stanza.
62. In other words, the image of the cross is a type of the life-giving cross where Christ was crucified, but it cannot be regarded as a type of the actual sufferings that Christ endured on the cross, or of any of the other events in the economy of salvation.
63. Num 21:9.
64. Pseudo-Denys, *De Eccl. Hier.* 4, 3, 1 (PG 3: 473).
65. You tried to conceal what cannot be hidden, much as your foolishness has now been revealed to everyone.
66. Isa 11:18.
67. Phil 2:7.

68. *Acts* 13:10. In this passage, Paul is addressing Elymas the sorcerer, so that Stephanos can become "a new Elymas."

69. The conclusion is rather abrupt. Theodore seems to imply that the words of his opponents are utterly absurd and indecent, but one should report them as they are, without passing anything under silence, as only so this way, people will become fully aware of the absurdity of these arguments.

70. *Isa* 52:6.

71. *Heb* 2:14.

72. See *Antirrhetica* 2, 48.

73. *Heb* 5:13.

74. Saint Gregory the Illuminator (257–331) is the founder and patron saint of the Armenian Apostolic Church. On the Armenian *topos* of Christ as a "dead image," see Agathangelos, *History of the Armenians*, trans. Robert Thomson (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), 91–95. Theodore draws the rather curious conclusion that it is only appropriate that images of Christ should lack breath and voice, as the dead Christ on the cross similarly lacked breath and voice.

75. These lines from Stephanos's second poem were already reproduced before paragraph XV.

76. *1 Cor* 12:2.

77. The idea is that the council fathers could see an image of Christ in front of their eyes as they were deliberating—something that was probably not the case in the fourth and early fifth centuries.

78. The last passage most likely refers to images of Christ that are on display on public buildings.

79. Pseudo-Athanasios, *Quaestio* 39 *ad Antiochum* (PG 28, 621–22). Theodore still attributed this work to Athanasios of Alexandria, but Migne already considered this work spurious.

80. This "declaration" (*hypographē*) is an iconoclastic profession of faith. Theodore comments on it for the next seventeen paragraphs and then adds an orthodox "declaration" in paragraph XXXV to conclude the discussion.

81. The Council of Hieria, held in 754, condemned the veneration of the images; the author of this iconoclastic "declaration" clearly regards this assembly as an orthodox council in line with the teaching of the first six ecumenical councils. The synod that "met to confirm the latter" is most likely the iconoclastic synod held at Hagia Sophia in 815, which condemned the Second Council of Nicaea and attempted to reconfirm the validity of the assembly of 754. See Milton V. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815," *DOP* 8 (1954): 153–60; Paul Julius Alexander, "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition," *DOP* 7 (1953): 37–66.

82. St. Tarasios (730–806) was patriarch of Constantinople during the latter phase of the iconoclastic crisis; in 787, he chaired the Second Council of Nicaea, which reaffirmed the legitimacy of the veneration of the images and approved the decisions of the Council of Hieria. See George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 178–80.

83. *Heb* 10:1. The New International Version translates, "The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming—not the realities themselves." The term *eikōn*, which usually indicates an image, here indicates the reality of what is promised. Theodore accepts the traditional attribution of this letter to Paul.

84. The reference from Gregory of Nazianzos is unidentified, perhaps *Or* 29 (PG 31: 89–91).

85. *Heb* 8:5. The reference is to Moses, who saw "a type" of the tabernacle on Mount Sinai.

86. *Heb* 9:24.

87. See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De Coel. Hier.* 1, 2 (PG 3: 121–22).

88. *Ps.* 33:7 in the Septuagint.

89. Pseudo-Dionysios, *De Coel. Hier.* 1, 2–3 (PG 3: 121–40).

90. *Gen* 9:6.

91. See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De Coel. Hier.* 1, 4 (PG 3: 141–44).

92. See *Vita Sancti Pancratii*, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, 10: 241–42.

93. Pseudo-Dionysios, *De Coel. Hier.* 1, 3 (PG 3: 121–24).

94. See Pseudo-Athanasios, *Quaestio* 39 *ad Antiochum* (PG 28: 621–22).

95. See Basil of Caesarea, *Homily* 17, "In Barlaam Martyrem" (PG 31: 489–96). At the end of this sermon, Basil calls the faithful to depict the martyrdom of the glorious Barlaam as well as the image of Christ.

96. This is a fragment from Gregory of Nazianzos's poem "On Virtue" (*Peri aretēs*); see Gregory of Nazianzos, *Carm.* 1, 2, 10 (PG 37: 738). To get the sense of the citation, it is necessary to reproduce a longer passage of this unusual poem (indeed, the only one where Gregory of Nazianzos talks of an actual image), in the translation by Jousteln Bornes:

> Neither will I pass over Polemon,
> For it was a marvel much spoken of:
> Formerly he was not counted among the wise,
> But rather he was a servant of exceedingly shameful pleasures.
> Later he was possessed by longing for the good,
> Having found a counselor—I need not say who,
> Whether a wise man, or even himself;
> Suddenly he was seen getting the better of the passions.
> So that I shall relate one of the marvels concerning him.
> A dissolute youth invited in a whore,
> But when—they say—she came up to the gateway,
> There, gazing at her, was Polemon in a painting.
> Seeing it—and it was awesome indeed—
> She left at once, defeated by the sight.

Put to shame by the one depicted, as if he were alive.

The Athenian Polemon was the head of the Academy from 314 to 276 BC and was known to have turned to philosophy after being a licentious youth. See Jonstein Børtnes, "Rhetoric and Mental Images in Gregory," in *Gregory of Nazianzos: Images and Reflections*, ed. Jonstein Børtnes and Thomas Hägg (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006), chap. 3, 37–58.

97. The reference to John Chrysostom is unidentified. The scriptural quotation is from Ps 72:22–23 in the Septuagint.

98. This is a reference to a brief *Oratio in Abraham et Isaac* that was attributed to Gregory of Nyssa but is now believed to be spurious. The Greek text of this sermon is contained in an Appendix to Silvio Mercati, *S. Ephraem Syri Opera*, Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica. (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1915), 107–11. In the passage quoted by Theodore, the author is talking of an iconic representation of the sacrifice of Isaac.

99. The reference is unidentified. Cyril (or the author of the passage) is talking of an icon representing the martyrdom of a young woman.

100. This is actually a reference to the Quinisext Council of 692; see Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 177–78.

101. Gal 1:8.

102. Num 25:1–15. It is curious that iconoclasts should be associated with Moab, who actually induced the Israelites to worship idols.

103. The reference is unidentified.

104. A rhetorical exaggeration, of course.

105. The version quoted by Theodore is actually the creed from the First Council of Constantinople held in 381, which revised the original creed of 325. See Philip Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (Ada, MI: Baker, 1969), 1:24–29; also Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their Histories and Theologies* (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 1990), 56–65, 115–19.

106. It is interesting that Theodore should use the masculine *ho gennētheis* for the divine nature, and the neuter *to gennēthes* for the human nature. A possible explanation might be that while the Father generates the eternal Son, who is the subject of all the actions of Christ, Mary generates the human nature—a substance, but not an individual hypostasis; see *Antirrheticus*, I, 4. Mary, however, is professed to be the Theotokos at Ephesus, so this explanation would be problematic for different reasons.

107. The humanity of Christ only exists because it rests in the divinity of the eternal Word, and the divinity of the eternal Word is manifest in this world only because it indwells the humanity that Christ took from his Mother. In this sense, within the hypostatic union, each nature is in need of the other.

108. On the christological reasons behind Ephesus, see McGuckin, *The Christological Controversy*, 193–222; see also Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 140–64.

109. The Council of Chalcedon (451) affirmed the dual consubstantiality of Christ with the Father and with humanity but did not address the question of Christ's wills. This issue, which resulted in the greatest church crisis of the seventh century, was finally resolved with the official acceptance of dythelitism by the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople III) held in 681. Interestingly enough, Theodore does not mention the Fifth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople II), held in 553, which asserted the identity between the pre-existent Word of God and the principle of subjectivity of the incarnate Christ. See Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 180–92, 240–47, 279–84.

110. Matt 27:15–21; John 18:39–40. In fact, it is the crowds rather than the "assembly of Caiphas" that demand the release of Barabbas. Theodore may want to associate the iconoclastic councils with the assembly of the Jewish priests who rejected Christ.

111. A rhetorical statement, as the Gospel accounts (Luke 23; John 18:28–38) do not tell us that Pilate actually "signed" a death warrant. The reed is one of the traditional instruments of the passion (*Arma Christi*), following Matt 27:29.

112. This is Theodore's own "declaration," in response to the iconoclastic text before paragraph XVII.

113. The Quinisext Council, held in 692 and also known as the Council in Trullo, banned the representation of Christ as lamb as well as the icon of God the Father. See Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 177–78.

114. The Second Council of Nicaea, held in 787 under Tarasios of Constantinople, was eventually accepted as the Seventh Ecumenical Council. See notes 81–82 above.

115. The Council of Hieria; see John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 180–83.

116. Migne places these two iconoclastic poems at the end of this section, without any commentary by Theodore.

117. This acrostic uses the first, the middle, and the last letter of each line, as well as the middle word of the middle line, which is here highlighted.

118. This acrostic only uses the first, the middle, and the last letter of each line.

119. Presumably, this indicates the powers of evil.

120. In Migne, these words form a cruciform pattern.

121. This stanza refers to the destruction of the famous image of Christ above the door of the imperial palace, which was carried out in 726 after the publication of the iconoclastic edict of Emperor Leo III. See Stephen Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III, with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources* (Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1973), 3–19. Leo III (685–741) and his son Constantine V Copronymous (718–75) were the great imperial sponsors of the first wave of iconoclasm. See also *Ode* 8.

Appendix

1. This canon, which is sung on the Sunday of the Triumph of Orthodoxy, was traditionally ascribed to Theodore the Studite, but the attribution is unlikely, as Theodore passed away sixteen years before the final restoration of the images in the year 842. This text was more likely composed after the synod held in Constantinople that year, either by St. Methodios of Constantinople (788–847), who was instrumental in reaching the final settlement with the iconoclastic party, or by someone close to Methodios. The rubrics in the Lenten Triodion say, "After the Dismissal of Matins and before the Liturgy, we go out in procession, together with the wood of the Cross and the sacred images, to the place where the Synodikon is to be read. As we go and as we return, we sing the following Canon." Given the crucial role of Theodore during the second wave of the iconoclastic crisis, it is only fitting that the tradition should view him as the author of this most important para-liturgical text.

Migne prefaces the text of this canon with an explanatory note from Baronius, *Ecclesiastical Annals*, t. 9, p. 1059:

> Another confessor, even if it could not have been Theodore the Studite (as the latter had already left this life before this time), at a different time, under the inspiration of God, wrote a hymn, which with its harmony delights the Church, and with a spur torments the perfidious iconoclasts; and at the time the church of Constantinople accepted that this hymn would be sung in procession, while the sacred images were carried in triumph; and so that nothing may be lacking from your joy for the defeat of impiety, and for the exaltation of the Catholic faith, we put this hymn here, so that it could be sung, decorated with the following inscription: *Celebratory, or victorious, canon, authored by Theodore the Studite, confessor, and separated from his Odes, received into use so that it may be sung, while the wood of the sacred cross of the Lord and the venerable images are carried in procession in Constantinople on the first Sunday of Lent.*

2. The stole refers to the sacred images, whose veneration was forbidden and is now again allowed.

3. John is probably John the Grammarian, who was patriarch of Constantinople between 837 and 843; see note 1 to *Refutations and Subversions*.

4. The church is no longer ashamed in rejoicing in the incarnate "form" of Christ.

5. These appear to be the names of two of Theodore's opponents. For Migne, Lezius is the same Leontios that is mentioned in some of Theodore's letters.

6. See 2 Tim 3:8, which was traditionally understood as a reference to the magicians defeated by Moses in Exod 7:9–12.

7. The Latin version reads "as a good shepherd."

8. As noted by Migne, the sign "θ" marks the trinitarian and the Marian doxologies that close Greek hymns; the first is followed by "Glory be…" and the second by "as it was in the beginning…"

9. In this case, the stole appears to refer to the human nature of Christ, which he took from the Virgin.

10. Lit. "which we consider in relationship."

11. Another list of leading iconoclasts, most of whom cannot be identified with certainty. Theodotos was the patriarch of Constantinople who reintroduced iconoclasm in 815; see Roman Cholij, *Theodore the Stoudite: The Ordering of Holiness*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 56, 61.

12. The customary condemnation of Arios—and of Nestorios in the following line—serve to position the ode in continuity with the teaching of Nicaea and Chalcedon. See *Refutations and Subversions*, XXVII–XXXVIII.

13. Probably a reference to uncanonical ordinations.

14. The leaders of the iconoclastic party are associated with practitioners of the magic arts, such as Simon Magos; see Acts 8:9–24.

15. Matt 26:3; Acts 4:6. The Council of Hieria is associated with the Jewish priests who condemned Christ; see *Refutations and Subversions*, XXXII, 167.

16. It is interesting that the author did not use the term *hypostasis*, which would have been the more common Cappadocian language.

17. This might be a reference to Mary's virginity *in partu* and *post partum*.

18. The twenty-eight years mentioned in this verse would go from the first year of the reign of Leo V the Armenian (813/14) until the death in 842 of Emperor Theophilos; see Patricia Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," in Cyril Mango, *The Oxford History of Byzantium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 153–69.

19. This is clearly a reference to the practice of walking around the church in procession with the sacred images.

20. The passage is obscure; it is unlikely that John the Grammarian was accompanied by a female prophetess who opposed icon veneration, although this may be a veiled polemical reference to Empress Eudokia (840–81), wife of Basil I and mother of Leo VI, who came from a famous iconoclastic family; see Karlin-Hayter, "Iconoclasm," 153–69. John is also said to be "of the false name" as he is unworthy of having the same name as John the Baptist (the forerunner of Christ), when in fact he should rather be the forerunner of Satan.

21. Presumably the baptismal name, John.

22. This passage may refer to the destruction of the famous image of Christ above the door of the imperial palace, which was carried out in 726 after the publication of the iconoclastic edict of Emperor Leo III. However, in 814, Leo V had again ordered the destruction of a prominent image. See also the very last iconoclastic poem at the end of *Refutations and Subversions*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The material is divided into four sections: (1) works by Theodore, (2) Christian works in the original language, (3) Christian and classical works in translation, and (4) secondary literature and reference works.

ABBREVIATIONS

CCSG: *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca*. Edited by R. Demeulenaere. Leuven: Brepols: 1977– .

PG: *Patrologia Graeca*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–86.

WORKS BY THEODORE

Bios kai Politeia (Vita et Conversatio). PG 99: 113–327.

Antirrhētikos Prōtōs Kata Eikonomacōn (Antirrheticus Primus Adversus Iconomachos). PG 99: 327–52.

Antirrhētikos B' Kata Eikonomacōn (Antirrheticus II). PG 99: 351–88.

Antirrhētikos Γ' (Antirrheticus III). PG 99: 389–436.

Elegchos kai Anatropē tōn asebōn poiēmatōn (Refutatio and Subversio Impiorum Poematon). PG 99: 435–78.

Problēmata Tina Pros Eikonomachous (Quaestiones Aliquae Propositae Iconomachis). PG 99: 477–86.

Kata Eikonomachōn Kephalaia Epta (Adversus Iconomachos Capita Septem). PG 99: 485–98.

Epistolē pros Platōna Ton Eautou Patera Peri Tēs Proskynēsōs Tōn Eikonōn (Epistula ad Platonem Ipsius Patrem De Cultu sacrarum Imaginum). PG 99: 499–506.

Canon Epinicius seu Victorialis. PG 99: 1767–80.

Sancti Theodori Studitae Sermones, Magnae Catecheseos. Rome: A. Mai. Nova Patrum Biblioteca 9/1, 1888.
Sancti Theodori Studitae Sermones, Parvae Catecheseos. Rome: A. Mai. Nova Patrum Biblioteca 9/2, 1888.
Fatouros, Georgios. *Theodori Studitae Epistulae, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae,* 31/1, 31/2, Series Berolinensis. Berlin, 1992.

Christian Writers in the Original Language

Acta Sanctorum. Vita Sancti Pancratii. Vol. 10, 241–42.
Athanasios. *Contra Arios.* PG 26: 9–525.
———. *De Incarnatione Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Contra Apollinarium.* PG 26: 1093–1169.
Basil of Caesarea. *Adversus Eunomium.* PG 29B: 497–772.
———. *De Spiritu Sancto.* PG 32: 67–218.
———. *Epistulae.* PG 32: 219–1115.
———. *Homiliae.* PG 31: 163–619.
Clement of Alexandria. *Pedagogus.* PG 8: 247–684.
———. *Stromateis.* PG 9: 9–602.
Cyril of Alexandria. *De Adoratione et Cultu.* PG 68: 133–1126.
———. *Glaphyrorum in Leviticum liber.* PG 69: 539–90.
———. *Quod Unus Sit Christus.* PG 75: 1254–1363.
———. *Thesaurus de Sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate.* PG 75: 9–1075.
Cyril of Scythopolis. *Vita Sabae.* Edited by Eduard Schwartz. In *Kyrillos von Skythopolis,* 85–200. Leipzig: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 4 (XLIX, 2), 1939.
Epiphanios of Salamis. *Ancoratus.* PG 43: 11–237.
Evagrios Pontikos. (In Migne: Nilus of Sinai) *De Diversis Malignis Cogitationibus.* PG 79: 1199–1234.
———. (In Migne: Nilus of Sinai) *De Oratione.* PG 79: 1166–98.
———. *Praktikos.* PG 40: 1219–51.
Germanos of Constantinople. *Epistulae Dogmaticae.* PG 98: 135–83.
Gregory of Nazianzos. *Poemata (Lib. I: Poemata Theologica).* PG 37: 397–969.
———. *Ep. 101 "Ad Cledonium."* PG 37: 175–90.
———. *Orationes.* PG 35: 387–1252; PG 36: 9–662.
Gregory of Nyssa. *Ad Ablabium (Cur Non Sint Tres Dei).* PG 45:115–35.
———. *Contra Eunomium.* PG 45: 239–1122.
———. *De Anima et Resurrectione.* PG 46: 11–160.
———. *Oratio Catechetica.* PG 45: 11–107.
Ireneus. *Contra Haereses.* PG 7A: 433–1223.
John Chrysostom. *Homiliae in Corinthos.* PG 61: 381–611.

———. *Homilia enkōmiastikē.* PG 50: 516–20 (spurious).
John Damascene. *De Fide Orthodoxa.* PG 94: 790–1226.
Leontios of Byzantium. *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos Libri Tres.* PG 86A: 1267–1394.
Mark the Ascetic. (In Migne, Mark the Monk) *Opuscula 1: De Lege Spirituali.* PG 65: 906–29.
Maximos the Confessor. *Ambigua.* PG 91: 1031–1417.
———. *Disputatio cum Phyrro.* PG 91: 287–360.
———. *Epistulae.* PG 91: 363–649.
———. *Liber Asceticus.* PG 91: 911–58.
———. *Mystagogia.* PG 91: 658–718.
———. *Opuscula Theologica et Polemica.* PG 91: 9–214.
———. *Quaestiones ad Thalassium.* PG 90: 244–785; also CCSG Vol. 7, Vol. 22.
Nikephoros. *Antirrhetici.* PG 100: 206–534.
Origen. *Comm. in Evangelium Joannis.* PG 14: 21–828.
———. *De Principiis (Peri Archōn).* PG 11: 111–413.
———. *Hom. in Lucam.* PG 13: 1801–1901.
Pseudo-Athanasios, *Quaestiones ad Antiochum.* PG 28: 597–699.
———. *De Pass. Imaginis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi.* PG 28: 805–12.
Pseudo-Denys. *De Coelesti Hierarchia.* PG 3: 115–368.
———. *De Divinis Nominibus.* PG 3: 586–996.
———. *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia.* PG 3: 369–585.
Scriptor Incertus. *Historia de Leonae Bardae Armenii Filio.* In Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia,* 335–62. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. Bonn, 1842.
Sophronios of Jerusalem, *Ss Cyri et Joanni Miracula.* PG 87C: 3363–3697.
Sozomenos, *Historia Ecclesiastica.* PG 67: 843–1131.

Christian and Classical Works in Translation

Aristotle. *Posterior Analytics.* Translated by Hugh Tredennick and E. S. Forster. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1960.
Basil of Caesarea. *Epistles.* In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 2nd series, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, Philip Schaff, and Henry Wace, vol. 8: *Basil: Letters and Select Works.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
Celsus. *Sermo Verus (True Discourse)* (fragments). Translated and edited by Horacio Lona in *Die "Wahre Lehre" des Kelsos.* Freiburg: Herder, 2005.
Cyril of Alexandria. *On the Unity of Christ.* Translated by John McGuckin. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.

Evagrios Pontikos. *Kephalaia Gnostika.* Translated and edited by Antoine Guillaumont in *Les Kephalaia Gnostika d'Evagre Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens.* Paris: Seuil, 1962.

———. *153 Texts on Prayer.* In *The Philokalia,* vol. 1, edited by Geoffrey E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware, 55–71. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

———. *Outline Teaching on Asceticism and Stillness in the Solitary Life.* In *The Philokalia,* vol. 1, edited by Geoffrey E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware, 31–37. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

———. *Texts on Discrimination in Respect of Passions and Thoughts.* In *The Philokalia,* vol. 1, edited by Geoffrey E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware, 38–52. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

———. *Praktikos.* In *The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer,* translated by J. E. Bamberger, OCS, 15–42. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981.

———. *Ad Monachos.* Translated and edited by Jeremy Driscoll. Ancient Christian Writers. Mahwah, NJ: Newman Press, 2003.

———. *The Greek Ascetic Corpus.* Translated by Robert Sinkewicz. In *Evagrius of Pontus: The Greek Ascetic Corpus.* Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

John Chrysostom. *Homilies on the Gospel of John.* In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 1st series, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, Philip Schaff, and Henry Wace, vol. 14: *Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of John, Hebrews.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.

John Damascene. *Three Treatises on the Divine Images.* Translated by Andrew Louth. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.

Gregory of Nazianzos. *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius.* Translated by Frederic Williams and Lionel Wickham. St. Vladimir's Popular Patristic Series. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.

Mark the Ascetic. *On the Spiritual Law.* In *The Philokalia,* vol. 1, edited by Geoffrey E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware, 109–24. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Plato. *Thaetetus.* Translated by Harold N. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library, 1921.

———. *Timeus.* Translated by R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library, 1929.

———. *Phaedrus.* Translated by Harold N. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library, 1999.

Plutarch. *Moralia* (vol. 5). Translated by Frank. C. Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library: 1936.

Porphyry. *Contra Christianos* [*Against the Christians*] (Fragment 77). In *Contra los Cristianos: Recopilación de Fragmentos, Traducción,* edited by E. A. Ramos Jurado, J. Ritoré Ponce, A. Carmona Vázquez, I. Rodríguez Moreno, J. Ortolá Salas, and J. M. Zamora Calvo. Cádiz: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cádiz, 2006.

Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa. *Oratio in Abraham.* In *S. Ephraem Syri Opera,* edited by Silvio Mercati, 107–11, Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1915.

Sophocles. *Electra.* Translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Loeb Classical Library, 1994.

Theophanes the Confessor. *Chronographia.* Translated and edited by Cyril Mango. *The Chronicles of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History (AD 284–813).* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Secondary Literature and Reference Works

Agathangelos. *History of the Armenians.* Translated by Robert Thomson. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.

Alexander, Paul Julius. "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and Its Definition." *DOP* 7 (1953): 37–66.

———. *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople: Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Allen, Pauline, ed. *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and Other Documents.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Anastos Milton V. "The Ethical Theory of Images Formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815." *DOP* 8 (1954): 153–60.

———. "The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclastic Council of 754." In *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.,* edited by Kurt Weitzmann. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasios: The Coherence of His Thought.* Oxford: Routledge, 1998.

Bagnell Bury, John. *Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802–867).* London, 1912; rep. Charleston, SC: Nabu Press, 2010.

von Balthasar, Hans Urs. *Cosmic Liturgy: The Universe According to Maximus the Confessor.* Translated by Fr. B. Daley, SJ. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2003.

Bigham, Stephen. *Epiphanios of Salamis, Doctor of Iconoclasm? Deconstruction of a Myth.* Rollinsford, NH: Orthodox Research Institute, 2008.

Bondi, Roberta C. *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Børtnes, Jonstein. "Rhetoric and Mental Images in Gregory." In *Gregory of Nazianzos: Images and Reflections,* edited by Jonstein Børtnes and Thomas Hägg, 37–58. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006.

Cattoi, Thomas. "The Symphonic Church: Chalcedonian Themes in Maximos the Confessor's Liturgical Theology." *Studia Patristica* 4 (2007): 123–29.

———. "Salvific Asymmetry: Anhypostasy and Icon Veneration in Theodore the Studite's *Antirrhetici*." *Studia Patristica* 51 (2009): 181–94.

———. "An Evagrian *Hypostasis*? Leontios of Byzantium and the "Composite Subjectivity" of the Person of Christ." *Studia Patristica* 68 (2013): 133–47.

Cheremeteff, Maria. "The Transformation of the Russian Sanctuary Barrier and the Role of Theophanes the Greek." In *The Millennium: Christianity and Russia, A.D. 988–1988*, edited by Albert Leong, 110–18. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990.

Cholij, Theodore. *Theodore the Stoudite: The Ordering of Holiness*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Clarke, Elisabeth. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Clerc, Charly. *Les théories relatives au culte des images chez les auteurs grecs du IIe siècle après Jésus-Christ*. Paris: Fontemoing & Cie, 1915.

Coakley, Sarah "What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does It Not? Some Reflections on the Status and Meaning of the Chalcedonian Definition." In *An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*, edited by Stephen T. Davis, David Kendall, SJ, and Gerald O'Collins SJ, 143–63. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Cooper, Adam. *The Body in St. Maximus the Confessor: Holy Body, Wholly Deified*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Daley, Brian E., SJ. "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium." *J. Theol. Stud.* 27, no. 2 (1976): 333–69.

———. "A Richer Union: Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ." *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993): 239–65.

———. "Nature and the 'Mode of Union': Late Patristic Models for the Personal Unity of Christ." In *The Incarnation: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*, edited by Stephen Davis, David Kendall, SJ, and Gerald O'Collins, SJ, 164–97. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Davis, Leo D. *The History of the First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their Histories and Theologies*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.

Driscoll, Jeremy. *Steps to Spiritual Perfection: Studies on Spiritual Progress in Evagrius Ponticus*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005.

Dunderberg, Ismo O. *Beyond Gnosticism: Myth, Lifestyle, and Society in the School of Valentinus*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Evans, David B. *Leontius of Byzantium: An Origenist Christology*. Dumbarton Oaks, Center for Byzantine Studies. Washington, DC, 1970.

Franzmann, Marella. *Jesus in the Manichean Writings*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Fuentes, Alonso J. A. *El divorcio de Constantino VI y la doctrina matrimonial de San Teodoro Estudita*. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1984.

———. "'Oikonomia' en la iglesia bizantina ante el divorcio de Constantino VI." In *Hispania Christiana: Estudios en honor del J. Orlandis Rovira* 24, 239–55. Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1988.

Gamber, Klaus. *Zeige Uns, O Herr, deine Barmherzigkeit: vom byzantinischen Prothesis-Bild zum spätmittelalterlichen Erbärmde-Christus*. Regensburg : F. Pustet ed., 1986.

Garrigues, Jean-Michel. *La Charité: Avenir Divine de l'Homme*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1976.

Gero, Stephen. *Byzantine Iconoclasm During the Reign of Leo III, with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources*. Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus CSCO, 1973, 346, 41.

———. "The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Byzantine Iconoclasts and Its Sources." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 68 (1975): 4–22.

———. "The Resurgence of Byzantine Iconoclasm in the Ninth Century According to a Syriac Source." *Speculum* 51 (1976): 1–5.

Goleizovskii, Nikita K. "The Message to an Iconographer and Echoes of Hesychasm in Russian Painting." *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* 26 (Moscow, 1965).

Grumel, V. "L'iconologie de Théodore Studite." *Échos d'Orient* 20 (1921): 264–71.

Gwynn, David M. *Athanasius of Alexandria: Bishop, Theologian, Ascetic, Father*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Halkin, François, ed. "La vie de l'impératrice Sainte Irène." *Analecta Bollandiana* 106 (1988): 5–27.

Harl, Marguerite. *Origène et la fonctione révélatrice du Verbe Incarné*. Paris: Seuil, 1958.

von Harnack, Adolph. *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*. Translated by John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007.

Hick. John. *The Metaphor of God Incarnate: Christology in a Pluralistic Age*. Louisville, KY: Westminster Press, 2006.

Hussey, Joan M. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1988.

Junglas, Johannes P. *Leontius von Byzans: Studies zu seinen Schriften, Quellen und Anschauungen*, vol. 7, 3. Paderborn, Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, 1908.

Karlin-Hayter, Patricia. "Iconoclasm." In *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, edited by Cyril Mango, 153–69. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Kitzinger, Ernst. "The Cult of Images in the Age Before Iconoclasm." *DOP* 8 (1954): 83–150.

Koen, Lars. "Partitive Exegesis in Cyril of Alexandria's Gospel According to St. John." *Studia Patristica* 25 (1991): 115–22.

Konstantinovsky, Julia. *Evagrios: The Making of a Gnostic*. London: Ashgate, 2009.

Krivocheine, Basil. *In the Light of Christ: Saint Symeon, the New Theologian (949–1022), Life, Spirituality, Doctrine*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986.

Lambertz, Erich. *Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum: Concilium actiones I–III*. Berlin: Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 2008.

Larchet, Jean-Claude. *La Divinization de l'Homme selon Saint Maxime le Confesseur*. Paris: Cerf, 1996.

Leroy, J. "Un témoin ancient des petites catêchèses de Théodore Studite." *Scriptorium* 15 (1961): 36–60.

———. "S. Théodore Studite." In *Théologie de la vie monastique. études sur la tradition patristique*, edited by G. Lemaitre, 423–36. Théologie Historique 49. Paris: Aubier, 1961.

van Loon, Hans. *The Diophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*. Leiden, Brill, 2009.

Louth, Andrew. *Maximus the Confessor*. The Early Church Fathers. Oxford: Routledge, 1996.

———. *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mango, Cyril, ed. *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mansi, Giandomenico. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. Vol. 11. Paris: H. Welter, 1902.

Maxwell, David R. "Christology and Grace in the Sixth-Century Latin West: the Theopaschite Controversy." PhD diss. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2003.

McGuckin, John. "The Theology of Images and the Legitimation of Power in Eighth Century Byzantium." *StVThQ* 37 (1993): 39–58.

———. *St. Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.

Meyendorff, John. "L'Image du Christ d'après Théodore Studite." *Synthronon* 3 (1967).

———. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. 2nd ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 1979.

———. *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.

Mühlenberg, Ekkehard. *Apollinaris von Laodicea*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969.

de Navascués, Patricio. *Pablo de Samosata y sus adversarios: estudio histórico-teológico del cristianismo antioqueno en el siglo tercio*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Agostinianum, 2004.

Norwich, John Julius. *Byzantium: The Early Centuries*. New York: Random House, 1988.

Ostrogorsky, George. *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.

Ouspensky, Leonid. *Theology of the Icon*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992.

Parry, Kenneth. "Theodore Studites and the Patriarch Nikephoros on Image Making as a Christian Imperative." *Byzantion* 59 (1989): 164–83.

———. "The Medieval Mediterranean Peoples, Economies, and Cultures," 400–1453. In *Depicting the World: Byzantine Iconophile Thought of the Eighth and the Ninth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *A History of the Development of Doctrine 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1974.

———. *A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980.

———. *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Pratsch, Thomas. *Theodoros Studites (759–826): Zwischen Dogma und Pragma: Der Abt des Studiosklosters in Konstantinopel im Spannungsfeld von Patriarch, Kaiser, und eigenem Anspruch*. Berliner Byzantinistische Studien 4. Frankfurt am Mein, 1998.

Rankin, David I. *Tertullian and the Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Rappe, Sara L. "Explanation in 'Enneads' VI. 7.1–15." In *Neoplatonism and Nature: Studies in Plotinus' Enneads*, ' edited by Michael Wagner, 71–99. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2001.

Rees, Silas. "The Literary Activity of Leontius of Byzantium." *J. Theol. Stud.* 19 (1968): 229–42.

Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, Philip Schaff, and Henry Wace, eds. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. 2nd series. Vol. 14: *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.

Romanides, John S. "St. Cyril's 'One *physis* (or *hypostasis*) of God, the Logos Incarnate' and Chalcedon." In *Does Chalcedon Divide or Unite?* edited by Paulos Gregorios, William H. Lazereth, and Nikos Nissiotis, 50–75. Geneva: World of Council of Churches, 1981.

Roth, Catherine. *St Theodore the Studite: On the Holy Icons*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981.

Russell, Norman. *Cyril of Alexandria*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Sachsen, Prinz Max von. *Der heilige Theodor, Archimandrit von Studion*. Munich: Georg Müller, 1929.

Sahas, Daniel J. *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm. An annotated translation of the sixth session of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Nicea, 787), containing the definition of the Council of Constantinople (754) and its refutation, and the definition of the Seventh Ecumenical Council*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Schaff, Philip. *Creeds of Christendom*. Vol. I. Ada, MI: Baker, 1969.

Schneider, Georg. *Der Heilige Theodor von Studios. Sein Leben und Wirken: Ein Beitrag zur byzantinischen Mönchsgeschichte*. Münster: Heinrich Schöning, 1900.

Scott, Alan. *Origen and the Life of the Stars: A History of an Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Sideris, Theodore. "The Theological Position of the Iconophiles During the Iconoclastic Controversy." *SVThQ* 17 (1973): 210–26.

Streza, N. "Aspect dogmatique du culte des icons chez Saint Théodore le Studite." *Studii Teologice* 29 (1977): 298–306.

Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae*. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics, 1981.

Thunberg, Lars. *Man and the Cosmos: The Vision of St. Maximus the Confessor*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

———. *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*. 2nd ed. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1995.

Treadgold, Warren. *The Byzantine Revival: 780–842*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Völker, Walter. *Maximos the Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1965.

van de Vorst, Christian, ed. "La Translation de S. Théodore Studite et de S. Joseph de Thessalonique." *Analecta Bollandiana* 32 (1913): 439–47.

Walter, Christopher. *L'Iconographie des Conciles dans la Tradition Byzantine*. Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1970.

Ware, Metropolitan Kallistos (Timothy). *The Orthodox Church*. London: Penguin Books, 1964; 2nd, revised ed., 1993.

———, with Mother Maria, trans. *The Lenten Triodion*. Waymart, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2002.

Wheelwright, Philip E. *Heraclitus*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959.

GENERAL INDEX

Adam, 108
Adoration, 27–28, 45; of prototype, 82; and veneration, 27–28, 137. *See also* Worship
Agraptodocetism, 20, 21–23, 31, 38, 40, 192n27
Akephaloi, 96
Ambigua (Maximos the Confessor), 25, 186n98, 194n48
Angels, 102–3, 162–63
Anhypostasis, 18, 19–24, 32, 36, 96, 192nn26–27, 198n18
Anthony, St., 10
Antichrist, 60, 147
Antirrhetici (Nikephoros), 21, 40, 192n27
Antirrhetici (Theodore the Studite), 1, 5–6, 7, 16, 24–25, 27–37, 38, 39, 40, 186n103
Antitype, 162
Aphthartodocetism, 21–22
Apollonarians, 96
Apophaticism, 32
Archetype. *See* Prototype
Arianism, 128
Aristotle, 10, 88, 193n46, 218n45
Asceticism, 10–11, 25, 26; Christ as paradigm of individual asceticism, 7
Athanasios of Alexandria, St., 63, 71, 194n46; atonement, 13; image of the emperor, 67, 70; veneration of cross, 35; veneration of icons, 42, 77, 161, 163

Baptism, 24, 50, 126
Basil of Caesarea, St., 6, 73, 75, 82, 84, 87, 122, 148, 190n4; ark of the covenant, 79–80; art of painting, 33, 53, 66, 163; artificial images, 66–67, 74; hypostatic union, 136; prototype and image, 60; veneration of images, 35, 74, 77, 164
Bulgars, 4

Capita Theologiae et Oeconomiae (Maximos the Confessor), 25–26, 185n89
Cappodocians, 1, 2, 6, 9, 41–42, 190n4, 193n31, 201n76
Celebratory Canon, 39; text, 171–78
Celsus, 8
Chalcedon, Council of (451). *See* Council of Chalcedon (451)
Cholij, Roman, 5, 180n5
Christ: artificial image of, 106–9; deification, 24–28; as paradigm of individual asceticism, 7; portrayal of Christ in the body, 89–106; presence of divinity in image, 34; prototype of own image, 35, 36, 65–66, 88, 108, 114–19,

subjectivity and agency, 13, 15–19, 21, 22, 192n26; suffering, 15, 32, 151–52; type of, 126; veneration of Christ and his image, 60–61, 109–14. *See also* Cross; Hypostatic union; Incarnation
Christology, 6–7, 13–14, 16, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 35, 213n3, 214n14
Church of the East members. *See* Nestorianism
Clark, Elizabeth, 9
Clement of Alexandria, St., 8
Coakley, Sarah, 14–15
Coenobitism, 3
Constantine V Copronymous, Emperor of the East, 2, 20, 23, 33, 41, 185n70, 194n52, 196n81, 199n44, 216n8
Constantine VI, Emperor of the East, 2, 3
Constantinople, Council of. *See* Council of Constantinople
Consubstantiality, 13–14, 26, 42; double consubstantiality, 16–17, 39
Contra Christianos (Porphyry), 8
Contra Haereses (Irenaeus of Lyon), 194n55
Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianas (Leontios of Byzantium), 16
Council of Chalcedon (451), 7, 20, 25, 27, 29, 30, 223n109; christocentric theology, 6, 13, 14, 35; Christ's subjectivity, 15–16; consubstantiality, 14, 42, 223n109; hypostatic union, 14, 15, 16, 17, 191n20, 192n23; Maximos the Confessor and, 1, 18, 19, 25, 37, 191n20
Council of Constantinople, 1st (381), 222n105
Council of Constantinople, 2nd (553), 223n109
Council of Constantinople, 3rd (680–81), 42, 44, 223n109
Council of Ephesus (431), 42, 166
Council of Hieria (754), 5, 14, 21, 22, 28, 41, 42, 43, 220n81
Council of Nicaea, 1st (325), 42, 165–66
Council of Nicaea, 2nd (787), 1, 41, 42, 168, 218n34, 220n81, 223n114; consubstantiality, 13–14; declared null and void, 5; veneration of icons, 2, 5, 37
Creation, 12
Cross, 51, 141–42, 143–44, 153, 156; divinity in representation of, 56; representation of, 35, 56, 67–69, 72–73, 153; type of the cross, 126, 156; veneration, 40, 57, 75–76, 110, 149
Cyril of Alexandria, St., 82, 164; hypostatic union, 15–16, 19, 30, 128, 206n31; Mosaic sacrificial law, 202n96; veneration of images, 70

David, 88, 162
De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia (Pseudo-Denys), 39
De Fide Orthodoxa (John Damascene), 6
De Principiis (Origen), 8
De Unitate Christi (Cyril of Alexandria), 15–16, 212n34
Deification, 24–27, 187n110; and obedience, 25
Denys the Aeropagite. *See* Pseudo-Denys the Areopagite
Detachment, 10
Divorce, 3
Docetism, 20, 21–22, 31; agraptodocetism, 20, 21–23, 38, 40, 192n27; aphthartodocetism, 21–22

Ecumenical Council, 1st (325). *See* Council of Nicaea, 1st (325)
Ecumenical Council, 3rd (431). *See* Council of Ephesus (431)
Ecumenical Council, 5th (553). *See* Council of Constantinople, 2nd (553)
Ecumenical Council, 6th (681). *See* Council of Constantinople, 3rd (680–81)
Ecumenical Council, 7th (787). *See* Council of Nicaea, 2nd (787)
Ephesus, Council of (431). *See* Council of Ephesus (431)
Epiphanios of Salamis, St., 86–87, 133, 204n118
Epistula 71 (Theodore the Studite), 181n15
Eucharist, 33, 194nn54,56
Eunomianism, 193n32, 201n96
Evagrios Pontikos, 6–7, 9–14, 21, 22, 25, 26, 31, 43, 193n32, 193n38, 206n23; Christ's subjectivity, 13, 15; inner iconoclasm, 12; *nous* of Jesus, 13, 17, 24

Faith, 28, 45

Gentiles, 161
Germanos of Constantinople, 20
Gnosticism, 218n48
Gold, 182n30
Gregory the Illuminator, St., 159, 220n74
Gregory of Nazianzos (the Theologian), St., 6, 63, 79, 81, 83, 85, 128, 162, 163, 190n4, 212n32, 218n36, 221n96
Gregory of Nyssa, St., 42, 164; condemnation of Eunomianism, 193n32, 201n76
Gregory Palamas, St., 2
Gregory the Theologian. *See* Gregory of Nazianzos, St.

Habakkuk, 31
Heaven, 26–27
Heresy, 4, 20, 35, 41, 161–62, 165, 166, 175–76. *See also* specific heresies, e.g.: Nestorianism
Hick, John, 187n112
Hieria, Council of. *See* Council of Hieria (754)
Holy Spirit, 35, 50, 65, 126
Homilae (Basil of Caesarea), 188n129, 196n86, 198n21
Honor, 75–77, 136
Hypostatic union, 7, 14–20, 26, 27, 29–31, 34, 39, 45–48, 93–99, 128, 134, 136–38; anhypostasis, 18, 19–24, 32, 36, 192nn26–27, 198n18; composite hypostasis, 19; di-hypostasis, 122; enhypostasis, 17–18, 22–23; mono-hypostasis, 122; subjectivity, 14–19; three hypostases, 121, 136, 137

Iconoclasm, 1, 4–7, 14, 20, 28–33, 38, 41; inner iconoclasm, 12; use of scripture, 32. *See also* specific headings, e.g.: Icons and images; Veneration; and titles of specific works, e.g.: *Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts* (Theodore the Studite)
Icons and images: angels as images of God, 162–63; artificial images, 36, 39, 74, 136, 106–9; Christology and, 6–7; dangers, of, 7–14; display versus veneration, 56, 59–60, 75–76, 135; divinity and, 34; honor,

75–77, 136; idols and, 57–58; in liturgical ceremonies, 162; mental images, 7, 9–10, 13, 107; natural images, 39, 74, 107; removal of, 5; use of scripture, 32; veneration, 24–27. *See also* specific headings, e.g.: Cross; Iconoclasm; Prototype; and titles of specific works, e.g.: *Refutations and Subversions* (Theodore the Studite)
Idols, 8, 57–58. *See also* Icons and images
Images. *See* Icons and images
Incarnation, 14, 15, 25, 29, 31, 32, 43, 122; absence of representation as negation of, 159; beautiful reciprocity, 18; goal of, 13; Jewish rejection of, 212n22; renewed incarnation, 26; saints as repeated incarnations, 25. *See also* Hypostatic union
Invective (Theodore the Studite). *See Skēliteutikos* (Theodore the Studite)
Irenaeus of Lyon, 194n55
Irene, Empress of the East, 3, 5, 180n10
Isaiah, 97, 102

Jesus Christ. *See* Christ
John Chrysostom, St., 2, 77, 87, 164
John the Cubicularius, 25
John Damascene, St., 2, 5–6, 37, 42
John the Grammarian, of Caesarea, 4, 39, 215n1
Joseph of Volokolamsk, 1
Judaizers, 179n1

Kephalaia Gnostika (Evagrios Ponticos), 12, 13, 15, 21, 43

Leo III, Emperor of the East, 20, 216n8
Leo V, Emperor of the East, 4, 5
Leontios of Byzantium, 6–7, 16–19, 21, 22, 23, 30, 43; anhypostasis, 21, 192n28; and Epiphanios, 86–87; Christ's subjectivity, 7, 198n132
Letter to the Hebrews, 8, 41
Letter to His Father Plato (Theodore the Studite), 39; text, 135–39
Liber Asceticus (Maximos the Confessor), 25
Lord's Supper. *See* Eucharist

Maccabees, 196n82
Magna (Theodore the Studite), 3
Mane the Persian, 38, 131, 192
Manicheans, 87, 93, 131, 159, 204n122
Marcion of Sinope, 152
Mark the Ascetic, 11
Mary, Mother of God, 14, 22, 35, 48, 65, 71, 166; artificial image of, 209n74; divine maternity, 42; praise of, 142–43, 144–45; veneration or worship of, 28, 61, 122
Maximos the Confessor, 6–7, 82, 198n19, 203n113; anhypostasis, 22, 23, 43; and Council of Chalcedon, 1, 18, 19, 25, 37, 191n20; deification, 25, 187n110; dythelite theology, 29, 44; hypostatic union, 18–19, 208n52; persecution of, 44
Meletios, Bishop of the Antioch, 77
Methodios, Patriarch, 43, 44, 224n1
Meyendorff, John, 7–8
Michael I, Emperor of the East, 4
Michael II, Emperor of the East, 5
Migne, J.-P., 37
Miracles of the Martyrs Cyros and John (Sophronios), 70–71

Moechian controversy, 2, 3
Monasticism, 3, 9
Monophysitism, 29, 23, 191n19, 206n33, 214n14
Montanists, 96
Moses, 49, 50, 96–97, 125, 156; Cherubim, 55, 81, 120–21; and cross, 40, 141, 153
Mystagogy (Maximos the Confessor), 186n95

Neo-Platonism, 7, 8, 9, 39, 188n122
Nestorianism, 16, 20, 21, 23, 31, 95, 166, 181n20, 192n28, 207n47; relational anti-Nestorianism, 17; semi-Nestorianism, 30
Nestorius, 133, 206n31
Nicaea, Council of. *See* Council of Nicaea
Nicene Creed, 35, 165
Nicodemus the Hagiorite, St., 206n33
Nikephoros, Patriarch, 5, 20, 21, 22, 40, 185n70, 188n128, 192n27
Nilus of Soras, St., 179n1
Noetic contemplation, 22, 24, 31, 50–51

On Prayer (Evagrios Ponticos). See *153 Texts on Prayer* (Evagrios Pontikos)
On the Spiritual Law (Mark the Ascetic), 11
153 Texts on Prayer (Evagrios Pontikos), 11, 12, 13, 182n38, 206n23
Opuscula Theologica et Politica (Maximos the Confessor), 18–19
Origen, 8, 9, 39, 209n80
Origenism, 7, 18, 19, 21, 23, 31; condemnation of, 20, 24; spirituality of, 7–14, 24

Paganism, 8, 13, 166–68
Painting, 33, 53–54, 66, 163, 164
Parva Catechesis (Theodore the Studite), 3
Patripassians. *See* Theopaschites
Patrologia Graeca (Migne), 37
Paul of Samosata, 26, 131
Philokalia (Evagrios Ponticos), 9, 12, 199n32
Platonism, 8–9
Polytheism, 49, 52, 137
Porphyry, 8, 51
Prayer, 11–12
Prepossession, 11
Proskomedia, 211n13
Prosthesis, 211n13
Prototype: artificial image distinguished, 107; Christ as prototype, 35, 36, 65–66, 88, 108, 114–19; of Christ's image, 35, 36, 65–66, 88, 108, 114–19; and image, 8, 36, 39, 55, 63–69, 75, 76, 82, 100, 107–19, 122, 136; veneration of image and prototype distinguished, 39
Pseudo-Denys the Areopagite, 35, 41–42, 162, 167–68; archetype and image, 39, 66, 122, 155, 156; image of the type, 162

Questions Posed by Theodore to the Iconoclasts (Theodore the Studite), 37, 38–39; text, 129–34
Quinisext Council (692), 167–68, 188n127, 196n77, 207n91, 212n36

Refutations and Subversions (Theodore the Studite), 37, 39–42; text, 45–119
Roth, Catherine, 27

Saints, veneration of, 24–25, 26–27, 27, 28, 58–59, 61
Scripture: icons and, 32; image of Christ, 123–24
Sermo Verus (Celsus), 8
Seven Chapters against the Iconoclasts (Theodore the Studite), 1, 37, 38; text, 120–28
Severus of Antioch, 20, 214n14
Shadow, 115, 162
Some Questions Posed by Theodore to the Iconoclasts (Theodore the Studite). See *Questions Posed by Theodore to the Iconoclasts* (Theodore the Studite)
Sophronios, 70, 133
Sozomenos, Hermeias, 183n41
Stēliteutikos (Theodore the Studite), 45
Symeon the New Theologian, St., 2, 203n108
Synod of Constantinople (842), 3, 5, 43

Tarasius, St., 220n82
Temptation, 10–11
Texts on Discrimination in respect of Passions and Thoughts (Evagrios Ponticos), 9, 13
Texts on Prayer (Evagrios Pontikos). See *153 Texts on Prayer* (Evagrios Pontikos)
Theodora, Empress of the East, 43
Theodore, archbishop of Antioch, 81
Theodore of Jerusalem, 202n92
Theodore the Studite, 1–44; arrest and imprisonment, 5; death, 5; early life, 2–3; exile, 3; and marriage of Constantine VI, 2, 3; monastic life, 3; transfer of relics, 2. *See also* specific topics, e.g., Iconoclasm; and titles of specific works, e.g. *Antirrhetici* (Theodore the Studite)
Theodosios, bishop of Caesarea, 202n97
Theopaschites, 15, 98, 207n46
Thesauros (Cyril of Alexandria), 70
Thesaurus de Sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate (Cyrril of Alexandria), 70
Thomas the Apostle, St., 85, 93
Thunberg, Lars, 18
Treatise on the Holy Images (John Damascene), 37
Trinity, 1, 2, 45, 46, 52, 58, 94, 129, 136, 137, 139
Triumph of Orthodoxy, 43, 44
Type, 162; antitype, 162; of the cross, 126, 156; sacraments as types, 53

Valentinians, 87
Valentinos, 148, 152, 204n122
Veneration, 45, 59–60; adoration and, 27–28, 137; holiness and, 78–80; honor and, 75–77; of human beings, 59. See *also* Icons and images
Virgin Mary. *See* Mary, Mother of God

Worship, 28, 59, 64, 137. *See also* Adoration

SCRIPTURE INDEX

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis
1:26 196n78, 209n81
9:6 221n90

Exodus
17:8–16 189n152, 216n5, 219nn49,51
19:13 196n83
20:4–5 192n29
20:12 200n62
25:17–22 219n60
25:18 211n3
25:18–22 193n34
25:40 211n4

Leviticus
26:1 196n76

Numbers
21:6–9 189n151, 216n5
21:7–10 211n3
21:8–9 193n5
21:9 219n63
25:1–15 222n102

Deuteronomy
4:12 207n36, 208n61
4:19 212n21
6:13 197n10

1 Samuel
2:12–7 201n78
17 204n1

2 Samuel
6:6–7 201n78

2 Kings
16:18 195n63
18:3–4 197n4
18:34 202n93
23:4–20 197n4
23:13 191n13

1 Chronicles
13:9–10 201n78

2 Chronicles
23:4–20 197n4

Psalms
22:16–17 207n41
23 204n1
33:7 221n88
67(68):11 190n6
72:22–23 222n97
117:2 218n30
148:5 211n7
151 204n1

Proverbs
8:22 205n11
8:25 205n12

Ecclesiastes
3:3–4 200n63
3:7 190n2

Isaiah
1:2–3 219n55
6:1 205n7
8:1 218n43
8:3 208n53
10:23 194n59
11:18 219n66
28:16 200n61
32:6 220n70
40:18 193n33
42:8 210n87
50:6 207n40
53:3 205n16, 207nn37–38

Jeremiah
2:12 218n29
10:3–4 193n39

Ezekiel
1:18 205n8
9:4 196n75

Hosea
13:14 202n94

Habakkuk
2:18 187n119, 193n38

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew
2:23 207n43
5:1 217n26
5:28 182n37
6:24 212n31
9:36 199n41
12:26 40, 219n52
12:31–32 219n57
14:28–32 211n14
16:13 206n28
17:23 211n15
17:26–27 206n30
18:10 208n57
22 38
22:18 211n16
22:20 196n79, 209n76
22:21 209n77
26:3 225n15
27:15–21 223n110
27:29 223n111

Luke
1:31 206n26
1:46–55 208n53
2:21 208n54
9:29 209n63
14:11 31, 193n40
22:19 194n51
24:39 202n102

John
1:14 207n43
1:18 197n13, 205n18
1:29 207n44
2:12 217n26
3:14 193n36
4:6 217n26
4:24 195n73
5:23 200n60
6:19 217n26
6:52 207n35
8:12 198n32
8:58 208n59
9:5 198n32
9:37 205n19
11:25 198n34
12:47 218n40
14:6 210n88
14:9 208n49
18:4–5 206n29
18:28–38 223n111
18:39–40 223n110
20:27 206n25
20:29 203n107, 206n24

Acts
2:31–35 211n8
4:6 225n15
8:9–24 225n14
13:10 220n68
17:23 201n81
17:29 211n5
25:21 201n83
25:25 201n84

Romans
1:21–22 209n65
1:23 209n69, 210nn1–2
1:23–25 209n64
1:25 191n15, 209n70
5:12–21 211n19
8:29 212n25
9:28 194n59

1 Corinthians
1:18 193n44
1:24 198n31
2:8 198n30
8:6 211n6
10:16 203n11
10:19 219n58
11:24 205n17
12:2 220n76
12:3 219n56
12:27 209n71
13:12–13 210n95
15:40 208n56
15:55 202n94

2 Corinthians
5:7 210n93
5:7–8 210n94
5:16 202n99, 203n111
6:14–15 191n13
11:7 212n26

Galatians
1:8 222n101
1:8–9 204n121
2:19 212n30
3:1 210n96
3:23 192n30
3:28 182n34
6:14 193n45

Philippians
2:5–8 217n19
2:6 211n7
2:6–7 208n58
2:6–8 209n68
2:7 205n15, 207n43, 219n67
2:10 198n33

Colossians
2:15 219n50
3:10–11 182n35

2 Thessalonians
2:3–4 218n31

1 Timothy
1:7 209n66
2:5 204n114, 212n23
6:20 190n1

2 Timothy
2:16 190n1
3:8 225n6

Hebrews
1:6 197n14
2:14 220n71
3:15 220n73

4:15 193n42
5:7 209n82
8:5 221n85
9:1–5 200n70
9:24 221n86
10:1 200n74, 221n83
12:20 196n83

1 Peter
2:9 212n27
2:17 200n64

1 John
1:1 217n25
1:1–3 189n157

Revelation
4:11 200n57
5:12 200n58
5:13 200n59

APOCRYPHA

Wisdom
6:5–6 199n52